CATHOLIC
IMPUTATION

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
FEB 2 1942
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BT 761 .L7
Livingston, Vanbrugh.
An inquiry into the merits
of the Reformed doctrine of

AN INQUIRY

INTO THE

MERITS OF THE REFORMED DOCTRINE

OF

"IMPUTATION,"

AS CONTRASTED WITH THOSE OF

"CATHOLIC IMPUTATION;"

OR,

THE CARDINAL POINT OF CONTROVERSY

BETWEEN

THE CHURCH OF ROME AND THE PROTESTANT HIGH CHURCH:

TOGETHER WITH

MISCELLANEOUS ESSAYS ON THE CATHOLIC FAITH,

BY VANBRUGH LIVINGSTON, Esq.,

RECENTLY A MEMBER OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

Tout ce qu'il y a de bon dans la doctrine Luthérienne, non-seulement étoit en son entier dans l'Eglise, mais encore s'y expliquoit beaucoup mieux, puis qu'on éloignoit clairement toutes les fausses idées : et *c'est ce qui paroît principalement dans la doctrine de la justice imputée.* Les Luthériens croyoient avoir trouvé quelque chose de merveilleux et qui leur fût particulier, en disant *que Dieu nous imputoit la justice de Jesus-Christ*, qui avoit parfaitement satisfait pour nous, et qui rendoit ses mérites nôtres. *Cependant les Scholastiques, qu'ils blâmoient tant, etoient tout pleins de cette doctrine.*"—Hist. des Variat. par Bossuet, Vol. i. Liv. iii. § 34.

"Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est."—*Vincent of Lerins.*

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY

THE RT. REV. JOHN HUGHES, D. D.,

BISHOP OF NEW YORK.

NEW YORK:
CASSERLY & SONS, 108 NASSAU STREET.
1843.

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
FEB 2 1942

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1843, by
THE AUTHOR,
In the Clerk's Office for the Southern District of New York.

DEAN, PRINTER, 2 ANN STREET, N. Y.

CONTENTS.

	Page
REVIEW OF TYNDALE, THE REFORMED "APOSTLE OF ENGLAND,"	1
" BISHOP LATIMER,	3
" HADDON AND FOX,	7
" ARCHBISHOP USHER,	12
" BISHOP BEVERIDGE,	17
" HOOKER,	25
" BISHOP ANDREWS,	37
" JOSEPH MEDE,	52
" BISHOP DOWNAME,	57
" BISHOP HALL,	72
" NICHOLSON, BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER,	74
" OXFORD DIVINES,	78
" DR. PUSEY,	80
" MR. NEWMAN,	81
" DR. PUSEY,	187
POPULAR CALUMNIES AGAINST THE CATHOLIC CHURCH,	210
THE USES OF ADVERSITY,	221
EVIDENCE OF THE SACRED WRITINGS,	231

INTRODUCTION.

WITHIN the last forty years, there has been, in the public mind of almost all Protestant nations, a growing disposition to reconsider the grounds of the great schism of the Sixteenth century, in consequence of which, so many have been separated from the unity of the Christian Church. During this period, numerous conversions to the Catholic faith have occurred, among men high in rank and station, and eminent in the walks of science and literature. England, the Low Countries, Switzerland, and the different States of Protestant, as well as Catholic, Germany, have all furnished remarkable instances. These examples appeared, at the time, to have had no effect on the general feeling of the nations in which they occurred. Nevertheless, it is almost impossible, in the good providence of God, that they should not have had great influence in predisposing the minds of others remotely, and perhaps without their own consciousness of the fact, to take a more calm and sober view of the whole controversy. The new religions had been undergoing the experiment of practice, for nearly three hundred years, side by side with the ancient faith. The results were before men's eyes ; and it required only a dispassionate and sincere mind to judge of them. On the one hand, the Catholics were seen held together, under the most adverse circumstances of civil and social relations, in the universal communion of one Church. On the other side, Protestants always disagreed among themselves. Every effort made towards attaining unity, resulted, among them, in fresh divisions. The Catholic Church was seen moving onward, amidst the convulsions and disorders of the times, in the same undeviating course which had been traced out for her from the beginning ;—the Protestants, on the other hand, exhibited the new system of religion as resting on no permanent

or immutable basis; but dependent on temporal circumstances, and the vicissitudes and uncertainty of human opinion. Under the former, reason recognized the dominion of faith in all matters of revelation; under the latter, reason was made the judge of faith itself; and the practical consequences could be traced, from the wild and fitful outbursts of religious feeling, which marked the first days of the great schism, especially in Germany, down to the cold and Christ-denying speculations of its rationalism in our own times.

The individual instances, to which we have alluded, of a return to the ancient faith, must have served as occasions for bringing these comparative results before the minds of serious and reflecting men of both communions. But they must have done more. The Catholic religion had been represented as suited only to ages of ignorance and mental darkness; and *this* prejudice must have been confounded, as men of the purest character, and most powerful intellects, were seen, from time to time, passing over to Catholicism in the full light of the nineteenth century. Such examples, and in increasing numbers, are witnessed from day to day. But within the last fifteen or twenty years, the controversy between the two communions has assumed new features, altogether favorable to Catholicity. Among the Protestant clergy on the continent, several distinguished authors have come forward to vindicate certain portions of ecclesiastical history, as well as the character of certain Popes, from the foul aspersions and misrepresentations of the earlier Protestant writers. In England, on the other hand, the venerable *dogmas* of the Catholic faith have been, to a great extent, vindicated in the writings of the Oxford Tractarians. In both cases, it is to be remembered, that the testimonies in favor of truth, are those of adversaries; but it is this circumstance that gives them additional weight, on the general bearing and issue of the great question. Protestants would not receive, generally, the testimony of Catholic witnesses on these subjects; but when some of the first men in their own ranks bear similar testimony, the effect is calculated to shake, to its very centre, the foundation of their prejudices against the ancient faith.

Accordingly, these writers are no longer to be regarded as individuals merely, but as leaders, representatives of whole classes ; organs, giving utterance, with a faltering voice, to the uneasiness, doubts, and struggles that agitate the breasts of thousands of their Protestant countrymen. If there be one impression that has seized on the minds of all sects and parties, except themselves, with the grasp of a *conviction*, it is, that the Oxford movement must lead its votaries into the bosom of the Catholic Church. There is but one other alternative possible ; and that is, that they should abandon the ground they have taken, retreat to the point from which they started, and rest satisfied with the religion which the laws of their country have prescribed for them. It is, however, a painful contest, between the spirit and the flesh. May Almighty God strengthen them by His grace, to accomplish the sacrifice which will best promote His glory, and secure their own salvation.

But the social, as well as religious condition of England, at the present time, is enough to convince wise men that the country requires a spiritual renovation, which the barrenness of Protestantism is incapable of producing. The moral sympathies, that should knit and bind together all classes, have been ruptured or dissolved. The wealthy aristocracy, the poor, and the middle classes, which should blend into each other at a thousand points of social and religious contact, are as distinct and separate, except in the material relations of self-interest, as the castes of Hindooism. Pauperism, unknown in that country during Catholic times, is now universal throughout the land. The domains of the monasteries, and of the Church, were formerly the patrimony of the poor, of which the monks and clergy were as the administrators for their benefit ; now these domains belong to the princes of Protestantism ; and for the poor, *work-houses* have been constructed from the ruins of the abbeys. In Catholic times, the clergy, by their state of voluntary celibacy, left the resources of the poor almost undiminished ; now, the whole church-livings are hardly sufficient for the extravagant modes of life and domestic ambitions of the married clergy. The extent of ignorance among the working classes, respecting the first principles of Chris-

tianity, would be incredible were it not attested by Reports of Parliamentary Committees. So that whether you regard the gilded corruptions of excessive wealth, on the one side; or the squalid depravities of extreme destitution, on the other; or contemplate the ignorance of religion, the infidelity, and desperate confederations of those who occupy the middle ground between them, it will appear evident, that the regeneration of such a people, even under the social aspect, requires the presence and the action of a religion which can infuse into its masses the warmth and vitality of the Christian virtues reduced into daily practice.

In alluding to these things as betraying, to the eyes of discerning Protestants themselves, the evidences of a moral and religious want, which the established Church is obviously, through its own intrinsic deficiency, unqualified to supply, we would by no means present them as the only, or even a prominent cause, of the general movement which is now going on in England, in the direction of a return to the Catholic faith. No; we would rather believe, humbly, that the progress of this movement is directed through the operation of that Grace which is invoked by the united prayer of millions, for the conversion of the English nation. But neither is it to be forgotten, that GOD, in HIS designs of mercy, may make use of outward sings, as well as interior convictions, to hasten the period of their accomplishment. He must be but a superficial reader of *things*, who does not see in the actual condition of England, what a powerful vindication of the Catholic faith, has been wrought out by the silent progress of human events—and what a deep stamp of failure has been fixed on Protestantism, as a social and religious experiment, by the same unspeaking, but intelligible test. It can hardly be supposed, that it was the mere learning or piety of the Oxford Divines, that has won for their views the sympathy and approbation of high secular powers in the state. Statesmen, no less than theologians, have advocated, and continue to advocate their views; and although these views do not yet avow the adoption of the whole Catholic truth, still, they are manifestly adverse to the essential principles of the entire Protestant system. Now, it is worthy of remark, that in every defence of these views

which they have deemed it expedient to put forth, the moral and social, as well as religious condition of the country, entered into their grounds of justification. Indeed, so much is this the case, that it is avowed in the brief title prefixed to the writings by which they have become so celebrated, "TRACTS FOR THE TIMES."

It is remarkable, under this view of the subject, that the Oxford Divines should have overlooked the matter which is treated of in the following pages. Among all the errors owing their birth to the innovations of the sixteenth century, there is not one so subtle as that which the Reformers adopted on the subject of justification by faith alone. It lies at the root of the whole system of Protestantism. It pervades, with but little modification, the doctrine of all the various sects, comprised under that comprehensive term. To it may be traced the peculiar and distinctive moral, as well as social features, that characterise every community or nation in which it has prevailed. It has chilled every generous emotion of self-sacrifice, and Christian heroism, which the charities of the Christian religion are wont to excite in the human breast, and which the ancient faith knows so well how to cherish, and ripen into the means of temporal and eternal benedictions to the whole human race. Why is it that Protestantism has produced no institutions for the welfare of mankind, which can be traced to the inward efficacy of any of its principles, acting on the human heart and soul? No universities, no hospitals, no churches, no asylums for the poor. Some of all these, it has unquestionably produced; but there is not so much as one, that can be traced to the inward power of any principle of Protestantism operating silently and secretly in the souls of men. Human legislation will be found to have intervened in all the Protestant countries of Europe; whereas those same countries had been almost paved with such institutions, resulting from the inward operation, without the aid of human laws, of the Catholic faith, in the hearts of men, before Protestantism began. Why has the latter system never produced a Xavier, an Order for the redemption of captives, a Vincent of Paul, or even a Sister of Charity? No one could fill the place of either of these, without being prepared to offer himself a daily sacrifice, or if need be, once

for all, for the good of his neighbor, which is only the second part of the LORD's commandment, carried to its point of heroism; and why is it that Protestantism has never been able to inspire this heroism into a single member of its communion? Who has ever heard even of a Protestant Sister of Charity?

We know, indeed, that such works have a place in the theory of the Protestant system; but in that theory itself, their sphere is restricted; within it, too, they are controlled by an arbitrary rule of divine economy; and even then, they are pronounced utterly unprofitable to the soul of him who performs them! How, then, can the Tractarians realize, in the Anglican communion, so long as this doctrine is not repudiated, those practical results which religion, operating internally on the hearts of men, is constantly producing in Catholic lands? Do men gather figs of thorns, or grapes of thistles?

Still, it must be admitted, that the idea of justification by faith alone, as it presents itself to minds trained up in the Protestant system, is plausible and seductive. As this subject, however, is seldom treated of in a popular way, it may be well to give a brief statement of the question, and a definition of the terms involved in it.

"Justification" is that action or operation of Divine Grace on the soul, by which a man passes from the state of sin; from an enemy, becomes a friend of God, agreeable in the Divine Sight, and an heir to eternal life. This act of transition from the one state to the other, with its operating causes, is called "justification." From the circumstance of its being a spiritual and interior operation, it is evident that it affords an opportunity for theological subtleties, to those who would make use of it; and, at the same time, renders it difficult to expose the error which those subtleties may be employed to foster. The Church, therefore, has always preserved her ancient and orthodox teaching under the form of sound words—which heresy has ever betrayed itself by refusing to adopt.

Thus, in both communions justification is acknowledged to be, as to its efficient source, from and through, and by JESUS CHRIST, alone. But in the Catholic system, this justification, occurring in the modes of the SAVIOUR's appointment, is not only the imputation, but also the interior

application of the justice of CHRIST, by which guilt is destroyed, pardon bestowed, and the soul replenished by the inherent grace and charity of the HOLY SPIRIT.

According to the Protestant principle, justification is when a man believes with a firm and certain faith or conviction, in his own mind, that the justice of Christ is "imputed" to him. This is that "faith alone," by which they profess to be saved. The sacraments, for them, have no other end or efficacy, except as signs to awaken this individual and personal faith, so called, and as tokens of communion. Neither is it, that any intrinsic or interior operation takes place in the soul, by this, in which she is changed by a transition from the state of sin, now remitted and destroyed, to a state of justice wrought for her and in her, by the application of the merits and infusion of the grace of Christ. No; this is the Catholic doctrine. But according to the Protestant principle, no such change takes place. According to that principle, the impious man is not made just, even by the adoption of God, or the merits of Christ. But leaving him in his injustice, it is conceived that his sins are no longer imputed to him, but that the justice of Christ *is* imputed to him. Thus, a criminal is under guilt and condemnation; but in consideration of a powerful and innocent intercessor, the chief magistrate pardons him. It is only by a certain fiction of thought and language that such a person can be considered innocent; or that his intrinsic guilt can be conceived of as still existing, but as imputed to the one who interceded for him, and the justice of that intercessor imputed to him. Such is the exact likeness of justification as taught in the theology of Protestantism. But it is to be observed, that the sphere which is assigned as the seat of this species of fiction, is the mind of GOD himself! The sinner is not intrinsically, or really justified, in this system; but we are told that GOD, on account of the merits of Christ, is pleased to regard and "repute" him as such; that is, GOD "reputes" him to be, what, in reality, HE knows him not to be!

St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, speaks of the faith of Abraham as having been reputed to him unto justice. And Luther, to meet the exigencies of his case, seized on the letter of this passage, and distorted its spirit and meaning. GOD had made rich promises to Abraham

and his posterity. The hope of this promise was in his son Isaac. And God, to try the faith of His servant, directed Abraham to immolate this, his only son, as a sacrifice to His name.

Such an order, under such circumstances, was calculated to throw deep and impenetrable mystery over the previous promises, treasured up in the mind of the Patriarch. Nevertheless, he falters not in his confidence, but obeys without a moment's hesitation. He sinks all the apprehensions arising from the suggestions of flesh and blood, and in the simplicity of his confidence, prepares to execute what had been commanded. And it is only when his hand is uplifted to strike, that God manifests his acceptance of the will, which, however, embraced the work itself, that he is no longer permitted to execute.

Such was the faith of Abraham. But it is evident that it embraced the works, and that so far as obedience, will, intention, purpose, and even feelings, were concerned, Abraham had already completed the sacrifice. This, the same Apostle writes in the Epistle to the Hebrews, ii. 17. "By faith Abraham, when he was tried, *offered Isaac;* and he that had received the promises, *offered up* his only begotten son."

As, however, the outward immolation was not actually or physically consummated, Luther was pleased to exclude it altogether from the faith of Abraham, contrary to the express words of St Paul himself. The error of Luther has been incorporated, with but slight modifications, into the theology of all the other Protestant denominations. Hence the doctrine of salvation by "faith alone." By faith, to use their own phraseology, the sinner "seizes" on the merits of Christ—by believing firmly that they are "imputed" to him. It is not that by this, he is made just or innocent, but God is pleased to *declare*, to *suppose*, to *repute*—let us say it with reverence—to *imagine* him as such. It is all God's work, he has not the smallest share in it—and then, the seductive boast of the system, that thus, "all the glory returns to God, and nothing to man." Under the same plea, good works were decried as hindrances, rather than helps, in the matter of justification. It was supposed, indeed, that by a necessary consequence, they would appear in the life of the believer, as the fruit

and evidence of his faith. But even then, they could be of no advantage to the soul. Neither could sin, except that of unbelief alone, defeat its salvation. To such a point of insanity did Luther carry his doctrine on this subject, that he declares, that "if adultery could be committed in faith, it would not be a sin." "Si in fide fieri posset adulterium, peccatum non esset."—*Luth. Disput.* t. 1, p. 523.

This doctrine is the root of all those distinctive features of Protestantism, which place its moral, as well as dogmatical code, so much in opposition to the ancient teaching of Christendom, and of the Catholic world. Calvin moulded it into his own system of Election, Predestination, Reprobation, and Inamissible Grace. The different confessions of faith have mitigated somewhat the harshness of language with which it was first set forth in the writings of the two great Continental Reformers. But its substance pervades them all. The extent to which it has prevailed in the Anglican Church, which is supposed to have departed least from the ancient faith, will appear in the little work which is now presented to the public. And humanly speaking, there is no hope for the Protestant world, even through the piety and learning that are represented by the Oxford Divines, until they themselves shall have burst through the intricate and subtle meshes of this elaborate net of primitive Protestantism. They seem to repine at not beholding among themselves, those fruits of religion, which they witness among their Catholic neighbors. But how could they expect it, while they teach that man's righteousness is solely by the mere imputation of the righteousness of Christ—and that this imputation is by *faith* ALONE, to the utter exclusion of good works, either before or after justification? Do they not see that this system leaves them no ground whereon to place the fulcrum, or apply the lever of either a moral, religious, or social regeneration?

We would not be understood by these remarks, to assert or insinuate, that the moral virtues are not attended to in the practice of Protestant communities as well as elsewhere. Far from it. But it is seldom that the conduct of men is in strict consistency with their creed, and in the present instance it is well known, that Catholics living up to the principles of their holy faith, would be infinitely

better than they are ; Protestants, on the same grounds, would be immeasurably worse.

In the Catholic Church, every age has witnessed the spectacle of thousands of individuals rising, by the power of Grace, above the ordinary range of righteous living, and devoting themselves by a perpetual sacrifice of all that is selfish, for the good of their neighbor ; and this for God's sake. Protestantism, after three hundred years of existence, cannot point out even one such example ! Why is it ? Now, the true type of the faith and the grace of the Catholic religion, is to be found in those higher examples to which we have just referred ;—whilst, if you seek a corresponding type, something that will exemplify the essence of Protestantism, you must be satisfied with the concentrations of it, in the coarse uncharitableness and unchristian exhibitions of it in Exeter Hall, and in kindred assemblies on this side of the Atlantic. It is true, and honorable as true, that the vast majority of Protestants in both countries, look upon such exhibitions with regret, and virtuous indignation ; but it is not less true, that for this, the genuine interpreters of their creed, regard and denounce them as only half Protestants, and half " Papists." There is more of truth in this uncourteous statement, than either side is aware of. Truth, and charity, and meekness, and patience, and all good works, are contemplated as implied conditions of justification in the Catholic system ; whilst they are as implicitly discarded from the Protestant justification, except, indeed, as consequences which, it is supposed, must necessarily follow.

But the stumbling-block with many, is the idea, that according to the Catholic doctrine, man is himself the author, in part, at least, of his own justification, through the supposed efficacy of good works, and human merits ; and that thus Christ is robbed of the glory which belongs solely to Him. Having stated briefly the Protestant doctrine, we shall now exhibit, with equal brevity, the Catholic teaching on the subject of justification.

The Catholic Church teaches, also, that Christ is alone the author and finisher of our salvation—that of ourselves we can do nothing without his grace—that all grace is the pure *gift* of God—that to him belongs the whole and undivided glory. This is the faith of the Catholic Church. But from this point the two sytems begin to diverge.

Supposing the existence of faith in the soul, which is regarded, in the Catholic system, as the "root of our justification," God imparts additional grace, by which it is increased and developed into the tree of a holy life, laden with its proper fruits of Christian charity. The operation of this grace is in the soul itself, renovating its powers, impaired and decayed as they had been by the contagion of original and actual sin. The sacraments are appointed channels by which Christ communicates this grace, and applies now, individually, to those who receive it, the merits of his own infinite sacrifice, once offered up on the Cross. He may communicate grace otherwise than by the sacraments, but however communicated, He is its source and author. One of the effects of this grace, is to enable the soul to *co-operate* with the inspirations which it communicates. Thus it disposes itself to receive farther aid from Heaven; and being still faithful in its correspondence with the new grace, it goes on in a progress of holiness, by which it approaches nearer and nearer to the perfect and adorable Author of its being.

In all this, what are termed good works, must necessarily enter. Sin must be avoided; for sin would displease God, and destroy his grace in the soul. Charity, the love of God, becomes the impulse by which such a soul is actuated. She will endeavor to keep the commandments, for this is given as the test of love. Nay, more, she will sometimes, for His sake, resolve on the sacrifice which is always necessary in order to accomplish those things which He has counselled, without having reduced them to the rigor of a universal precept. She will sell all that she has, and give it to the poor, in order to have treasures in Heaven. Here the Catholic doctrine of the "merit of good works," comes in. Is it, that according to our faith, any thing that man can do, even with the aid of grace, creates a *right* in virtue of which he may claim a recompense from God? Certainly not. Is it that any works of his, can enter, as a portion, into the price by which he was redeemed? By no means. Nevertheless, the Church teaches, founding her doctrine on the express word of God, and the excess of His goodness and mercy, that He himself bestows on works thus performed through His grace, and for His sake, and His love, a merit which He

will recompense with eternal rewards. But are these rewards on account of any intrinsic merit in the actions themselves as the mere works of men? Surely not. Long before Luther began to pervert the writings of St. Paul, St. Augustine declared in two words what had ever been, and still is, and ever will be, the faith of the Church on the subject, viz.: GOD in *rewarding* His saints, but crowns in them the effect of His own grace.

Where, then, is there room for that calumny which the *radical* error of the sixteenth century put forth against the Church of God, viz.: that she robbed CHRIST of His glory in the justification of sinners, by making it partly the work of man himself? This calumny is still propagated, and by it, thousands are prevented from returning to the fold of Christ.

We have exemplified the Protestant doctrine of justification by a human comparison; we shall endeavor to represent the Catholic tenet by another.

A man gives capital for trade to a number of persons who are utterly penniless and starving—more to one, less to another. He places them in a sphere of commerce, in which, if they are attentive, industrious, and prudent, they will acquire much wealth; but in such a way, that the measure of the increase is also owing to the goodness of him who gave the original capital. In this, two things concur to the same end: his liberality, and their co-operation; but can they glory on this account, as if their fortune was owing to themselves, or their works? Certainly not; and yet the same goodness of their patron, may induce him to reward, as merit in them, that industry with which they employed his money. And what is this, after all, but the lesson of our LORD'S teaching in the parable of the talents—and for the proper use of which, it was said, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant, *because* thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will set thee over many; enter into the joy of thy Lord."

This is the doctrine of justification, as taught in the Catholic Church; the grace of CHRIST, which is HIS gift, is the capital renovating the powers of the soul, and enabling her to enter into the commerce of charity, which has GOD and the neighbor for its objects, and by which "treasures," in the language of Scripture, may be laid

up in Heaven. See how this commerce has been carried on in the Church from the beginning! See the Apostles, the martyrs, the confessors, the virgins, the missionaries, the teachers of the ignorant, the friends of the poor, of the sick, of the captives, even the buriers of the dead, give up the world, renounce their own ease, embrace voluntarily the mortifications of the Cross, and by a perpetual sacrifice of self, become the living, and not unfrequently, the expiring victims of their love for their fellow beings, and of HIM who died for all! The world has always been full of wickedness, and always will be; but notwithstanding this, amidst its social convulsions, and its hereditary corruptions, see, how in every age since the beginning of Christianity, men rose and girded themselves up for CHRIST's sake, to battle in the armor of faith, and with the weapons of holy charity, against the peculiar disorders of the times. The infidel corsair sweeps the sea, carrying Christians into slavery. But the grace of CHRIST has inspired other Christians with the heroism of charity, by which they bind themselves in a solemn vow, to seek the captive in a barbarous land, to redeem him with money, or if need be, to take on their own limbs the chains of bondage which they have stricken from his! Plague and pestilence are desolating the land, and thousands of delicate and tender virgins are ready to rush into the atmosphere of death, and ministering at the bed-side of the sick and dying, occupy the place which the cowardice of mere flesh and blood had caused even relatives to abandon! But all this, again, is through CHRIST, who inspires this supernatural courage, and crowns as merits in the members of HIS mystical body, the fruits of HIS own grace. Now, if such things occur at all times, and in all places of the Catholic Church; and if, on the other hand, the world has yet to witness the first example of them in the Protestant communions, does it not follow, that there is, *there must be*, some deep and radical cause to account for the difference? Unquestionably, there is. The Protestant dogma of a forensic imputation of the merits of Christ, and of justification by "faith alone," explains it all. No other key is necessary.

It is not pretended that in the ordinary virtues of social and domestic life, Protestants are inferior to any others. Still, even these, it is manifest, derive no support from

their doctrine of justification, and must be accounted for on other grounds. But above the range of every-day duties, performed in a genteel and respectable manner, where is there a name that stands prominent on the page of self-sacrifice for the good of others? We have sometimes heard the names of Howard and Wilberforce mentioned as instances. They, certainly, especially the former, were above the ordinary standard in the reformed ranks; but yet how immeasurably below any corresponding type in the Catholic Church. The one visited the institutions for erring and suffering, or destitute humanity, which had been founded by the spontaneous charity of Catholic lands, or the civil laws of Protestant states—and recorded the reflections of his mind, and the sympathies of his benevolent heart. Even this was much. The other poured out his eloquence, and his gold, if you please, to meliorate the conditions of an afflicted portion of his fellow men. But neither of them showed any thing like a willingness to undergo themselves, for their MASTER'S sake, a portion of the sufferings they would mitigate or remove.

The Oxford school is the only one in the history of Protestantism, that seems to have caught a ray of the light and warmth of Catholic faith on the subject of justification. Neither is this so manifest in what are called their principles, as in the tone of a deeper spirituality, piety, meekness, and a desire to foster more the love of GOD, and of man. These feelings appear under the surface of their writings, as if struggling for an issue, and a right direction. Hence the innovations with which they are charged. Fasting, confession, and most of the practical devotions of the Catholic Church, are reported to have found favor in their sight. But, alas! so long as the fundamental error of the Anglican system on justification, remains, what *practical* progress can they make with the masses of their people? It is said they would establish Protestant monasteries; but who will be the monks?—That they would have *daily* service in their churches; but who will attend the worship, except a few devout females whose hearts unconsciously obey the instinct of that Catholic faith against which their understandings have been so perversely instructed?—That they would rid the churches of pews, so that, as in Catholic times, the rich and poor may worship together; but do they imagine that the haughty lords of

England, who fenced round in their exclusive boxes, will hardly kneel before their MAKER, albeit they are tempted by soft and velvet cushions to do so,—will mingle in any direct contact of equality with the poor? No, no! such results cannot be anticipated, so long as both are taught to believe that justification is by "faith alone." But going beyond the precincts of the temple, how will the Oxford Divines be able to infuse into the Anglican system any principle of spiritual fruitfulness, whilst *this* tenet prevails? How will they go forth to their rich and proud contrymen, preaching, like St. Paul, the "chastisement of the body," and the "crucifixion of the flesh?" How will they meet the dark, sour discontent of religious, as well as civil chartism, in the millions of their countrymen, with the words of the SAVIOUR Himself, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of GOD." How will they reduce to the simplicity of faith, and obedience of CHRIST. the spiritual haughtiness and double-dealing of their middle classes? How, in a word, can they renovate their Church, or distil a healing balm into any of the wounds, religious, moral, social, or physical, of their suffering land, so long as they and their countrymen remain alike paralyzed by the frozen grasp of the fundamental error of their system to which we have alluded? They may, indeed, preach and write with the force and eloquence, and even unction of a Chrysostom or a Paul, but yet so long as the present system of the Anglican Church remains, their words will return on them as feathers cast against the wind. Still, however, all these things are in the hands of GOD—who can employ the things that are not, to confound the things that are.

In the mean time, we have great pleasure in presenting and recommending the following pages, on this great question, to the good favor of the public. They are the fruits of the leisure hours of a learned and amiable lay-gentleman, who has himself been brought to the communion of the Church through the Oxford writings. His experimental knowledge of the two systems has enabled him to appreciate the importance of each, and his familiarity with the best lights and highest authorities of the Anglican Church, has enabled him to weave a chain of testimony from their writings, of which the first link is Tyndale, and the last, (proh! dolor!) Rev. Mr. Newman. The reader

will easily perceive the slippery nature of the *error*, in marking the discrepancies of views, in the successive dignitaries who upheld it; and the tremendous labor, *finesse* of speech, and wrenching of terms, with which alone it could be explained (?) or defended. The author has accompanied these testimonies with his own reflections, interspersed with occasional testimonies of Catholic writers and Councils, setting forth or witnessing the uniform teaching of the Church. He does not present his little work as a synopsis of Catholic doctrine, even on the subject of which it treats; but rather, as its title implies, an inquiry into the subject as held by the Church of England. But his intimate knowledge of the Anglican system, in which he was educated, enabled him to bring out and connect together, the best arguments of the most distinguished divines in that communion; and to show their utter deficiency, when tested by Scripture, the teaching of the primitive church, and the ordinary rules of right reasoning.

We shall add farther, (and this at the request of the respected author himself,) that he has not, on the one side, hesitated to employ many of those terms which in the Protestant writings and discussions on "Imputation," "Justification," &c., have acquired a kind of *technical* meaning with which Catholics are not familiar; nor, on the other hand, has he deemed it essential to adhere to that strictness and precision of language which would be expected in a formal theological treatise. It is believed, however, that with the brief "statement of the question," in a preceding page of this Introduction, the subject will be found at once intelligible and interesting even to those who are not accustomed to metaphysical investigations. The effort of the author to aid, however feebly, those who (and at this time, their number is not small,) are engaged in that struggle, through which his own mind has passed, of a transition from the uncertainties of human speculations, to the simplicity of positive and unchanging faith,—will be well received, and kindly appreciated by all who can estimate, at their proper value, the sublime dignity, the immortal destiny, and the true interests of the human soul.

AN INQUIRY

INTO THE

MERITS OF THE REFORMED DOCTRINE

OF

"IMPUTATION,"

&c., &c., &c.

As the articles of the Church of England maintain so strict a reserve on the doctrine of Imputation, notwithstanding it forms the cardinal feature and basis of the Protestant reformation, we propose to notice the system as held and explained, first, in the writings of some of the early English reformers, and, afterwards, in the works of some of the most distinguished divines in the above-named establishment.

We commence, then, with an extract from a work on Justification, published in 1530, by Tyndale, who is styled by Fox, "the Apostle of England." "For as the Apostles," says Fox, "in the primitive age first planted the Church in truth of the Gospel; so, the same truth being again *decayed** and defaced by enemies in this our latter time, there was none that travailed more earnestly in restoring the same in this realm of England, than did William Tyndale."

TYNDALE.

The substance of his views is sufficiently expressed in the following passage, from a work which he published on the reformed doctrine of Justification, in answer to Sir Thomas Moore :†

"When Paul saith 'faith only justifieth,' and James,

* As if *Truth* were capable of decay or susceptible of corruption.
† Fathers of the English Church, pp. 285—292.

that 'a man is justified by works, and not by faith only,' there is a great difference between Paul's *only* and James' *only*. For Paul's only is to be understood that faith justifieth in the heart and before God, *without help of works*, yea, and ere I can work." "But James' only is this wise to be understood, that faith doth not so justify that nothing justifieth save faith. For deeds do justify also. But faith justifieth in the heart before God, and the deeds before the world only."

What confusion of language, and ludicrous contradiction, does the above passage exhibit! And yet it contains the substance of the grand Protestant distinction between faith and works. It cannot be denied that Luther was far more consistent in his error than many of his disciples, and especially on this point, by his refusal, *in toto*, to admit the epistle of James among the canonical books.

Let us note, then, in the above, that, by "Paul's only," we are, according to Tyndale, particularly to understand that faith justifies without works *only before God*. And, on the other hand, by "James' only," that we are to understand, while faith justifies in the aforesaid manner, deeds also justify; but, in this case, "*before the world only*," and *not before God*, since this, according to Tyndale, is the province of faith without works in the sense of "Paul's only!" From this, it follows that, while faith justifies alone and without works, according to "Paul's only," works also justify alone without faith, according to "James' only." Hence is acknowledged two distinct and *formal* causes of our justification, neither of which, it is evident, are divine or consonant with Scripture, but both equally worthless and absurd. For faith without works is, evidently, no better than works without faith; and the "great difference, between Paul's only and James' only," is made to consist in the notion that the former refers only to God, and the latter only to the world! The above reasoning, in fine, however absurd it may seem, constitutes the very basis of the reformed doctrine of Justification according to the legal and judicial acceptation, as it is called, of the term, in opposition to the Catholic sense, as held by the Church of Rome.

BISHOP LATIMER.

The following is from the celebrated Bishop Latimer, another of the early and distinguished English reformers.

"When we believe in Christ, we be like as if we had done no sin at all; for his righteousness standeth us in good stead, as though we, of *our own selves*, had fulfilled the law to the uttermost."*

To understand the meaning of the above passage it is necessary to bear in mind that the personal righteousness of Jesus Christ is held to be so accounted to us, "as though we, of *our own selves*, had fulfilled the law" *to its very letter*. In this manner, Tyndale also says, we are considered as if we were "full righteous," which he, moreover, explains by affirming that it is equivalent to "God's justifying us *actively*." Hooker also says that the same personal obedience is *so* accounted to the creature that he is thereby considered as "more perfectly righteous than if he himself had fulfilled the whole law."†

In all this *we* are held to have obeyed the law *according to its letter*, and as if this were done by *our own selves*, and in the same personal manner as it was effected by Jesus Christ in "the days of his flesh." The whole of the reasoning, therefore, proceeds upon a contradiction and an absolute impossibility; and what renders the absurdity more striking, is its maintenance with an opinion that this mode of justification is effected by a supposed act and sentence of the law.

Since, then, it is an obvious contradiction to suppose that we could have obeyed, of our own selves, in the manner in which Christ obeyed, so is it equally an absurdity for us to believe that we could be either made or accounted just by such a vain and preposterous supposition. So far, then, from this being an act of justifying faith, on our part, it is no less than an act of downright folly and presumption. But when Protestant divines consider faith as nothing more than mere opinion, it must

* Fathers of the English Church, Vol. 2, p. 485.
† Hooker on Justification, § 6.

cease to be a wonder that they should speak of it as a "poor and mean virtue, or as "*the bare* and *empty* hand of a beggar."* But it certainly is surprising that men of such learning could suppose it possible that man could be either made or accounted just by God, merely and barely through such a senseless and presumptuous notion of the creature. Bishop Hopkins, however, on the contrary, thinks "It is very wonderful that the Papists, (as he calls them,) should so obstinately resolve not to understand this doctrine of imputed righteousness, but still cavil against it as a contradiction." "And some," he adds, "besides this *slander* (*!*) of a contradiction, give us this scoff into the bargain; viz. that the Protestants in defending an imputative righteousness, show only an imputative modesty and learning."†

Such, however, is the Protestant idea of our most holy faith, and such the imputative manner by which we are, said to be, accounted just in the sight of our Creator. We add, moreover, that such is the cardinal principle of the Protestant reformation; and, according to its supporters, in the words of Bishop Hopkins, "the very sum and pith of the whole Gospel, and the *only end* of the covenant of grace."‡

But to return to the reformer Bishop Latimer. If we actually believe that the righteousness of Christ is accounted to our persons, in the manner above described, by a mere human faith alone, we are, then, according to him, considered by God, "so that we be like as if we had done no sin at all;" and "as though we, of our *own selves*, (*!*) had fulfilled the law to the uttermost," that is, strictly so, according to its letter! In other words, we are accounted just before God, not only for believing what is, in itself, a manifest contradiction to all reason, but, moreover, for the presumptuous notion that we are considered by him as just as the unspotted victim himself who fulfilled the law for us in his own flesh! Nay, as Hooker says, "more perfectly righteous than if we

* Archbishop Usher's Sermons, No. 12.

† Bishop Hopkins' Works, Vol. 2, p. 323. Bishop Hopkins is commonly designated by a large portion of the English church as "a giant" in theology.

‡ Doctrine of the Two Covenants.—Works, Vol. 2, p. 382.

ourselves had fulfilled the whole law." (!)* "Therefore," says Bishop Latimer, "let us study (so) to believe in Christ." "Let us *patch him* with nothing. (!) It is his doing only." That is, he means, without us or any co-operating agency on our part, save the bare believing act of what is called "faith alone," or, as Tyndale, as we have seen, expresses it, faith according to "Paul's only," as distinguished from "James' only." "O! what a joyful thing," he continues, "is this! what a comfortable thing is it! that we know now that neither devil, hell, nor any thing in heaven or earth shall be able to condemn us when we (thus) believe in Christ."†

In another discourse, he says, that "The preacher hath a busy work to bring his parishioners to *a right faith*, as Paul calleth it—to a faith that embraceth Christ and trusteth to his merits; a lively faith, a justifying faith, (in short,) a faith that maketh a man righteous *without respect of works*, as ye have it very well declared and set forth in the Homily."‡

But as faith, according to him and the Protestant creed, is only alone in its justifying office, or when it accounts a man to be righteous, without actually making him so, since it is on the imputative principle without respect of works, neverthless, it is, he maintains, not alone *after* the man has been once made just. For, in a sermon before King Edward, he says,

"Faith is a great lady, and she hath ever a great company and train about her. First, she hath a gentleman-usher that goeth before her; and where he is not, there is not Lady Faith. This gentleman-usher is called knowledge of sin. Now, as the gentleman-usher goeth before her, so she hath a train that cometh *behind*, they be all of Faith's company, they are all with her—her whole household, &c., &c.; and these be the works of our vocation, when every man considereth what vocation he is in, and doth the works of the same, as to be good to his neighbor, to obey God, &c. Faith is never without her train; she is no anchoress; she dwells not alone; she is never a private woman." (!!)§

* Hooker on Justification, § 6.
† Fathers of the English Church, Vol. 2, p. 677.
‡ Ibid, p. 640. § Ibid, p. 652.

Such are the ludicrous shifts and expedients to which the first reformers resorted in order to illustrate and sustain their absurd distinction between faith and works; and such are the arguments which are still gravely appealed to by their admiring followers of the present day, as evidences of their profound knowledge and most spiritual discernment!

In the train, referred to above, Latimer reckons hope and love; and his description of the latter, in comparison with faith herself, is strongly characteristic of the imputative opinions in relation to "faith alone" in "her justifying office." "Though love," says Latimer, "be the chiefest, yet we must not attribute unto her the office which pertaineth unto faith only. Like as I cannot say, the Mayor of Stamford must make me a pair of shoes, because he is a greater man, yet it is not his office to make shoes; so, though love be the greater yet it *is not her office to save.*"*

Here the office of faith is so confounded with the principle itself that we cannot know whether he means to hold that there is, indeed, any such power in man, or, whether he intends to call the justifying office, only, by that name. If the former is not meant to be disputed, it does not even then appear that she is of any further service after the termination of the justifying office. For when the shoemaker has finished the shoes, which is the only business, it seems, he is capable of doing, why should his presence in the train be any longer wanted when his services are no longer required; and when the Mayor of Stamford is, now of himself alone, sufficient for the accomplishment of every future end; seeing, moreover, that nothing is, *now*, to be added or diminished in regard to the past and completed work of the former?

And, again, as love and good works are, by no means, necessary to salvation, on Protestant grounds, we cannot

* Fathers of the English Church, Vol. 2, p. 677. In other words, the love of God, though it be shed abroad in our hearts, has, according to Latimer, neither power to justify nor to save! Seeing that this office belongs, as Usher says, to the "poor virtue of faith," and to which, notwithstanding that "love be the greater," "God hath," in the words of the same divine, "given it a name above all names."(!!)

perceive the reasons why the reformers should, on their own maxims, require the exercise of them after justification, any more than previously to that work. For although, without holiness, no man can, according to Scripture, see the Lord, yet, according to the reformed doctrine, our salvation is perfectly secured by a mere transient or momentary act of faith alone, which we are taught is quite sufficient to save us thoroughly, even before holiness *within* can possibly begin to operate!

And, now, lest it might be thought that the passages which we have adduced, and still purpose to refer to as evidences of the reformed doctrine, have not been selected in an impartial or candid manner, we have to request our readers to bear in mind that our intention is to confine them only to such as have been appealed to and cited by divines in the English church of the present day, as of the highest authority in behalf of Protestant principles, as contradistinguished from the Catholic faith, as held in communion with the Church of Rome.

HADDON AND FOX.

Let us, now, attend to the account of the imputative system, as given by the celebrated author of the "Martyrology," in a joint work by him and Dr. Walter Haddon. The latter was chosen by Cecil, the secretary of Queen Elizabeth, to defend the English reformation against the writings of a Catholic divine, by the name of Osorius. The work was commenced by Haddon, but he having died during its progress, it was completed by Fox, who was expressly chosen for that purpose, under the special direction of the above-named minister of state. It is very appropriately styled by Strype, "a *state* book," and is also described by him as "a public vindication, (i. e. on political grounds,) *the like to which he knew none*, except Bishop Jewel's Apology."

In answer to the Catholic argument, that living faith is never alone without charity, and that, therefore, it is not faith alone, but only the faith which is connected with charity, that justifies, we find in the above-named work the following statement:—

"If all things that go commonly after a certain manner together and be done together, must be coupled and applied to one and the self-same operation, by this reason it must come to pass, that he that hath feet, eyes, and ears, shall be supposed to go not upon his feet only, but to walk upon his eyes, and to see with his ears. For the matter goeth none otherwise in faith, hope, and charity, which three heavenly jewels, albeit they be instilled into us by the free liberality of God with remission of sins, and cleave fast with one subject, yet every of them is distinguished by its several properties and functions notwithstanding."

In this extract, which professes to treat of justifying faith, this virtue is assumed and held to be in perfect accordance with the Protestant theory, or nothing more than a mere operation or act of the mind, in the place of a mysterious and supernatural gift. Such a distinction, indeed, is essential to the support of the reformed or imputative system, and, as such, is invariably held by the English divines under the names of a *justifying act* and a *justifying office*. In like manner, we have already seen, that it is so considered by the reformers whom we have before noticed. Proceeding, therefore, upon the same hypothesis, it is, in the above-cited passage, asserted that, "by this reason it must come to pass that he that hath feet, eyes, and ears, shall be supposed to go not upon his feet only, but," &c. But if we suppose the absurdity of dissimilar acts, in the manner referred to in the preceding sentence, as being connected and "done together" with the "*self-same operation*," as is there expressed, then is it quite easy to conceive of such ridiculous consequences and suppositions as the writer imagines. But be it remembered that it is not the Catholic, but the Protestant doctrine only, which describes faith as a *mere* act, or office, or operation of man. And we, therefore, reply, that when men attempt to degrade the heavenly virtue of faith to such supposed or imputative conceptions as the above, it is not to be wondered at that they should couple them with conclusions equally absurd. For such a faith is but an idle mockery of the name—a vain and empty shadow without a substance—a *vox et preterea nihil*.

Such, however, is the way in which the advocates of the imputative scheme speak of this spiritual and mysterious gift, and which is so emphatically described, in Holy Writ, as the power of God unto salvation, and the very substance of hope and every grace flowing from above, both in time now, and in eternity hereafter.

Again we read, "If you will demand farther yet what this faith worketh? I do answer, according to the several properties thereof, *two manner of ways*, faith worketh salvation through Christ, (i. e. one way,) and it worketh obedience of the law by charity," (i. e. *another* way!)

Now, since it is maintained that "faith worketh salvation, through Christ, in one way, and through obedience to the law in *another* way," we merely ask, without stopping for the present, to inquire into the doctrine of these two different ways of salvation, as contradistinguished from the unity of the Catholic way, in what "manner of way" is it meant that faith worketh salvation through Christ? The answer to this we are informed is, by "free imputation only" of the merits of Christ, and that the work is, by St. Paul, "ascribed wholly to *imputation*." "Finally," it is asked, "what shall become of all those sweet and most amiable promises of God, if, according to the rule of this doctrine, we shall be excluded from our assuredness of salvation, and God's free imputation?" It is then concluded, that "we are made the righteousness of God through Christ, by *the very same reason* whereby Christ was made sin for us."

And here we see "the very same reason" which we intend to notice in the writings of Bishop Beveridge, and of Hooker, and of other divines of the English church, and which same reason is, in fact, nothing less than the profane, as well as absurd one, of "*accounting Christ as a sinner*," in order that we might be accounted righteous; instead of accounting him, with the Church, as an unspotted victim—a holy sin-offering—and an immaculate substitute for the sins of the world. In the same strain of sophistry it is continued, "But Christ was not made sin but by *imputation* only; *ergo*, neither are we *made righteous* in the sight of God but by *imputation only*." In other words, made righteous without receiving the inward gift of righteousness. What contradiction! what

aspersions upon the Saviour! what reflections upon the justice of his members!

After what we have already said of this fallacy of mere imputation, it is hardly necessary to remark, here, that, if there be no other way or manner by which we are made just, however creditable and praiseworthy such an imputation may appear in the sight of men, it is, we confidently affirm, both on the authority of the Written Word and the universal testimony of the Church in all ages, to be one of the deepest and most monstrous delusions which have ever been palmed upon the Christian world. Nevertheless, it is here added that, "In the whole work, (i. e. of this carnal or profane imputation,) *the mercy of the Lord* doth bear the whole and full praise and palm."(!)

"And where," it is again triumphantly demanded, "is now that solemn decree of the Tridentine Council, whereby we are not only accounted righteous, but be both truly called righteous and be also truly righteous in the sight of God?"

Our authors, now, after stating as above, that "faith worketh salvation through Christ," in the manner as we have seen, argue that it also "worketh obedience of the law by charity" in another way. Still it is added that such a faith as this latter, which works only by charity, "must needs be insufficient to the full measure of absolute righteousness and perfect felicity." But since, in this system, "nothing that is not *absolute* can," according to the words of Hooker, "enter the kingdom of Heaven,"* how does it follow, that the mere simple *act* and solitary *office*, called *justifying faith*, (!) is all that is sufficient to meet the claims of this *absolute* righteousness? Be this however as it may, they conclude that the Catholic faith, which worketh obedience by charity in a manner so "*imperfect!*" and so different from that of the justifying office of the Protestant faith, by which the absolute obedience of Christ is imputed, is altogether insufficient to procure our salvation through the merits of the Redeemer, or attain to the perfect felicity of heaven. But here we can only say in regard to what they describe as

* See Hooker on Justification, § 31.

the only justifying faith which worketh salvation, that, we may rest assured, there is positively no such faith approved of in the whole volume of inspiration, none such given to man out of the treasures of Him from whom alone cometh down every good and perfect gift. Such a preposterous or reputed gift, indeed, as that which forms the basis of Protestant justification, is, even according to the admission of the reformers themselves, a most empty and barren virtue, notwithstanding it is said in the words of Archbishop Usher, that "God hath given it," ("poor and mean," as he maintains it to be,) "a *name* above *every name!!*"

But, according to the doctrine of the reformers, as expounded in this work of Haddon and Fox, this is the justifying faith which procures us Christian salvation. And this great end, they say, it accomplishes, not because it works by love, but merely "because it doth believe in Christ Jesus," in "the manner of way," in which we have seen them to describe it.

Before we conclude our comments upon this celebrated "state book," we cannot forbear to notice the distinction made between the justifying act and the succeeding fruits. It is held, then, that the latter, which follow after the former, constitute only a bare and naked proof of faith, or doth simply "show a special demonstration of *pure* and *true* faith," but have nothing to do with the pure and true office of justifying. Thus it is that the solitary and bare office or mere act of justifying faith, as it is called, is that, alone, by which a man is accounted just; and the good fruits which follow are nothing more than *our own* works or merits, which are compared to the empty "badges of noblemen's servants," serving only to indicate the office which they hold. But if we are, it adds, to be considered really and actually just through the power of faith, instead of being merely so accounted by God when we are not and cannot be so in truth, as is otherwise decided by the "solemn decree of the Tridentine Council," "then let us," it adds, "be bold and *blush not* to root out withal the whole nature and essential substance of all mystical divinity, and *let us raze out the very foundations of all our religion.*" (!)

The only righteousness therefore which, according to

this remarkable "state book," is acknowledged to be in man, is the righteousness of his own works and of his own merits. And these things, moreover, which the Scriptures so emphatically denounce as "filthy rags" or as so many abominations in the sight of the Lord, are, according to these reformers, the only proper evidences of actual holiness, and "doth show a special demonstration" of the truth and purity of that mere act or bare office which they denominate *Christian* faith. The latter, alone, they say only *accounts* us to be accepted in the Beloved, while the former alone, they add, really and actually *makes* us holy!

ARCHBISHOP USHER.

As the radical and distinguishing doctrine, therefore, of the first reformers respected the distinctive manner in which the justice of Jesus Christ is imputed to man, so has it ever formed the characteristic heresy of Protestantism, amidst all the varieties and discrepancies of its belief. The whole structure, in fine, of its teaching on the merits of the atonement is founded on a species of imputation which its advocates universally affirm to be based on, what they term, a *judicial* and *external* process or sentence of the law. "This," says Archbishop Usher, "is imputative righteousness as it is in the articles of the Church of England."* And whatever difference of opinion may exist between the various sects of the reformation on other points, in this they are unanimously agreed, that it constitutes the "great protestant and gospel doctrine" of imputation.

"This great benefit," Archbishop Usher further states, "is applied unto us and apprehended by us, on our part by faith alone," by faith considered also as an "empty hand," "being *only* (or merely) the instrument to convey it" (i. e. the justice of Jesus Christ) "unto the soul."—That we are healed by it, in the same manner, as the Israelites were by *simply looking upon*, or by "gazing at"

* See his Discourses on Justification, in which the above is frequently expressed.

(in the words of Bishop Mede) "nothing else but only the brazen serpent."*

This Protestant mode of accounting to us the righteousness of Jesus Christ, he, also, states is in direct opposition to "the folly of Popish Doctors, who persuade the multitude to rest in a blind faith which they call implicit and folded up; telling them that it is enough for them to believe as the church believes, though they know not who the Church is; whereas the Scripture teacheth us that faith comes by hearing; that is, by hearing the blessed promise of grace† offered to the people."‡

Again, he says, in the same work, that this mode of imputing to us the righteousness of Christ is merely "to quit and to discharge from guilt and punishment, and so it is a judicial sentence opposed to condemnation, and merely accounts or considers the law to be satisfied;" in contradistinction from the infusiom of a perfect righteousness into our natures; (since "that comes," he adds, "under the head of sanctification;") and that the special kind of righteousness which is imputed to the man in this manner, "is carefully to be distinguished from" a distinct principle or "power purging the corruption of sin which follows after."

As an illustration of the kind of righteousness which the Catholic faith imputes to man, in contradistinction from Protestant tenets on this point, we will here relate an anecdote concerning Archbishop Usher, applicable to the subject at issue between the two creeds:

"Being wrecked on a desolate part of the Irish coast, he applied to a clergyman for relief; and stated, without mentioning his name or rank, his own sacred

* His language is as follows: "For as the Israelites, by the same eyes by which they looked upon the brazen serpent, saw other things; but were not healed by looking upon any thing else but only the brazen serpent; so though by the same faith whereby I cleave to Christ for remission of sins, I believe every truth revealed; yet I am not justified by believing any truth but the promise of grace in the Gospel."

† But the Archbishop has omitted to mention that while "the Scripture teacheth us that faith comes by hearing," it likewise cautions us to "take heed *how* we hear" the blessed promise of grace offered to the people, lest we receive the grace of God in vain.

‡ See Usher's "Body of Divinity," pp. 194, 198.

profession. The clergyman rudely questioned it, and told him, peevishly, that 'he doubted whether he knew the number of the commandments.' 'Indeed I do,' replied the Archbishop mildly—'there are eleven.' 'Eleven,' said the clergyman; 'tell me the eleventh, and I will assist you.' 'Obey the eleventh,' said the Archbishop, 'and you certainly will'—'A new commandment I give unto you—that ye love one another.' "*

Now this principle of Christian love or charity, referred to in the above-named new commandment, is the special and only kind of righteousness or obedience which can justify us in the sight of God; in contradistinction from that law which came according to the letter of the ten commandments, and by which the whole race of man is condemned and no one justified. For as the letter of these precepts killeth, so, on the other hand, their spirit giveth life in our resurrection from the dead, in Him who was delivered and put to death for our offences through the judgment of the law, but raised again, by the Almighty Spirit of God himself without the law, for our justification unto life eternal.

In relation to this Protestant doctrine of imputing to us the justice of Christ, which began with the patriarch of the so-called reformation, Archbishop Usher says, it "condemns the proud opinion of Papists, who seek justification, (as he ignorantly affirms,) by their *own* works, and righteousness inherent in themselves."† The Cath-

* Butler's Book of the Church, p. 254.

† This gross ignorance of the Catholic doctrine is the more remarkable, seeing that it appears in one of whom it is said that he devoted a period of eighteen years of daily study to the Fathers, beginning with those of the first century, and continuing his task until he had read the works of all, in their chronological order. In relation to his own doctrine of faith to the exclusion of good works, in contradistinction, as he tells us, to "the proud opinion of Papists," it cannot be denied that it is marked throughout with the same unintelligible distinctions which characterize every Protestant exposition of the same that we have ever met with. Indeed, we may truly say of the Archbishop what Mr. Hallam says of the first so-called Apostle of the Reformation, that, "I have found it impossible to reconcile, or to understand, his tenets concerning faith and works; and can only perceive, that if there be any reservation in favor of the latter, not merely sophistical, of which I am hardly well convinced, it consists in distinctions too subtle for the people to apprehend." (Hallam's Introduction to the Literature

olic faith, on the contrary, most explicitly acknowledges no other merits whatever, than those which flow from the Cross of Calvary. And while it rejects the Protestant or legal imputation of the same, as a mere fiction of the imagination, it expressly teaches that the righteousness of Christ is both imputed and infused, as well for our justice as for our holiness, and that the reformed doctrine of sanctification by our own righteousness and works is in itself an *unqualified denial* of the sanctifying merits of the atonement. Which religion then most magnifies the imputed merits of Jesus Christ? The Catholic, which teaches their communication to man by an infusion through the justifying and sanctifying Spirit of God? or the Protestant, which admits their application only by an imputative sentence of the law?

But this doctrine of legal imputation, which Archbishop Usher maintains to be the fundamental principle of the articles of the English Church, is by no means peculiar to that body. On the contrary, all the Protestant sects,

of Europe, p. 510.) Here we may further remark, that notwithstanding many divines in the English establishment disclaim the peculiar doctrines of Luther on faith and works, still the latter is really more consistent in his error than the former. For, in the first place, as Luther clearly saw that his interpretation of St. Paul could not be reconciled with the teaching of St. James, he boldly pronounced the writing of the latter to be a spurious document, or, in his own words, "an epistle of straw;" and, in the next place, as his exposition of St. Paul differed so widely from that of St. Jerome, he says, that "Jerome, far from being rightly canonized, must, but for some special grace, have been damned for his interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans." (Ibid. p. 510.)

But this teaching respecting the merit of good works was by no means confined to Luther or the continental reformers, for it seems also to have been a fundamental article in the creed of Tindal, one of the early fathers of the English Church, whom we have before noticed, and of whom Fox says, "he is yet called the Apostle of England," as the former is termed the Patriarch of the Reformation in general. Hume, speaking of the same, has the following: "*Tindal*, Joye, Constantine, and others, even in Henry's reign, asserted, in conformity to the Lutherans, and other Protestants, that salvation was obtained by faith alone; and that the most infallible road to perdition ('*Sacrilegium est et impietas velle placere Deo per opera et non per solam fidem*'—*Luther adversus regem*,) was a reliance on good works; by which terms they understood as well the moral duties, as the ceremonial and monastic observances." (*History of England*, vol. 4, p. 418.)

without distinction, expressly maintain that the righteousness of Jesus Christ is accounted to us in the same legal way as the sin of Adam is imputed,—i. e., according to the old law of works. The Westminster Confession expressly imputes it to *our persons* in contradistinction from *faith itself;* and the same, also, accords with the teaching of the great majority of divines in the English establishment. Indeed, as the whole system of the reformed faith is founded upon the doctrine of a legal imputation, there is no possible way of explaining it otherwise than in consistency with its leading hypothesis.*

* The *distinguishing* error, in fact, of the Protestant religion on this article of the Christian faith will be found, as we have before remarked, to consist in its use of the scriptural words "*impute*" and "*justify*" in a *legal or judicial sense.* As this is expressly maintained by all the writers whom we have cited on the subject in the Church of England, so it does not seem to be confined to any school of Protestant divines in particular. The manner of illustrating the doctrine by a comparison with the process of a civil court of law, is common with the most distinguished theologians among them who have written on the subject. Hooker, and Andrews, and Usher, and other eminent authorities of the high church party in the English establishment, are all staunch advocates of this legal system. It being evident, therefore, that no one could, with consistency, continue a member of the establishment to which the above-named writers belonged, and, at the same time, reject the anti-Roman tenets which they claim as its professed creed, we take the liberty of quoting from our "Remarks on the Oxford Theology," the following extract on this subject:

"But if man would have us to understand the justification of a sinner according to its signification in a mere human tribunal, and in the way in which he justifies his fellow-man in his own courts of law, then do we maintain it to be directly at variance with the sense in which God has revealed it in His Holy Word. Now it is and ever has been a fundamental principle in the laws of civilized man, in all ages and nations, that the accused is presumed in the eye of the law to be innocent until he is actually proved to be guilty. When a man, therefore, justifies his fellow-creature from an alleged crime, he merely acquits him of that particular charge; and by such a justification the accused, notwithstanding the sentence of the law, is left just where he was before his accusation,—that is, innocent, or not guilty in the eye of the law of the specific offence of which he was accused. In his trial, the court proceeds upon the fallibility of the charge for which he is arraigned; and when he is said to be justified according to the sentence of the law, the meaning is only that he is justified from the charges preferred against him, which have been declared, according to the law, to be unfounded; and he is, therefore, pronounced to be undeserving of punishment. His justification by the sentence of the law, is not

BISHOP BEVERIDGE.

Bishop Beveridge, in his discourse on the eleventh article of the English Church, supports the very same idea of imputation which we have seen in the writings

an acquittance from its condemnation, but from the imputation of offences of which he had been accused, but which accusation was not substantiated by legal proof. Such is the sense of justification, considered as a forensic term in the practice of civil courts,—a justification in which there is no room for the forgiveness of guilt, still less for the imputation of righteousness. But how different is the justification of sinners by God! How unlike are the ways of mercy and truth towards man in the gracious counsels of the 'Majesty on High!' How dissimilar the case of our rebellious race under the law of condemnation, and the inexorable sentence of its penalty!

"So far indeed from our being accounted *at any time* as innocent in his sight according to the law, we have all by its power become unprofitable servants; there being 'none that doeth good,' 'no not one;' having been already weighed in its balance and found wanting. The supplicating language of the man after God's own heart is, that the Lord would 'hearken unto him' 'for his truth and righteousness' sake,' and not enter into judgment with him; for in God's sight, according to the judgments of the law, 'shall no man living be justified.' All, therefore, who are not justified by their faith from the law of Moses, are still 'sitting in darkness' under the shadow of its death, and the curse of its righteous judgment. For we are ever to bear in mind that those who are justified by God are accounted by his law as condemned criminals, upon whom its sentence has already been pronounced, whose own lives are already forfeited to the divine justice, and who have nothing to hope for from the law, but only mercy through the grace of a compassionate Father and Redeemer. Now, as these are the things from which we could not be justified by the law of Moses, which 'worketh wrath,' how can it, with any shadow of propriety, be said that God justifies the ungodly in conformity with the analogies of man in relation to his fellow-man, according to the sense of the forensic or legal term in a court of civil jurisprudence; and this, too when the Scriptures so unequivocally declare our justification to be by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law?"

To the above we now add, that if there be a fact more distinctly made known to us, above all others, in the Sacred Writings, it is that Jesus Christ did *not* come into the world to justify us, according to a *forensic* principle of the law, but that he came to suffer for us as an innocent substitute, under the sentence of its penalty, in order that we might be justified by an inherent work of His Spirit, according to the new law of his own body, which is the Church of the Living God.

of Archbishop Usher. He says that the righteousness of Christ is accounted to us in the same manner as is the sin of Adam. And, therefore, we add, that, as neither the Protestant nor the Catholic denies that "*sin* is accounted by law," so while the former imputes the merits of Jesus Christ in this way, the latter altogether rejects such a system of accounting, as a fatal innovation upon the primitive and catholic faith of the Christian church.

Bishop Beveridge again says, that the righteousness of Christ is accounted to us, not by the "inhesion (or infusion) of grace in us," as at all necessary for our justification; but, simply, by a *mere external* imputation of its merit. But while he maintains that the justice of our Redeemer is so accounted, it is, nevertheless, he admits, only "by the inhesion of grace in us that we are sanctified." In this, he testifies with Archbishop Usher, to the unanimous Protestant recognition on this their cardinal distinction between justification and sanctification; affirming it to consist, not simply in a difference as to the *modus operandi*, but as being also essentially distinct in the unity of their principle, or in the substance of their graces. In this manner it was, he maintains, that the faith of Abraham was accounted to him for righteousness, "not as a principle in him," but simply by an external act, or judicial sentence of the law.

"Which also," he continues, "further appears, in that justification is here said, (Rom. iv. 3,) to be of the ungodly, 'who justifieth the ungodly.' For, as long as a man is ungodly, he cannot be said to be justified by any inward and inherent, but *only* by an *outward* and imputed righteousness;* so that justification is properly opposed to accusation. So, St. Paul plainly, 'who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? it is God that justifieth; who is he that condemneth? it is Christ that died.'—(Rom. viii. 33, 34.) Who shall accuse or lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? The Devil, their own consciences;† but it is God that will justify

* But as man is, always, according to the Scriptures, accounted to be ungodly in this life through the sentence of the law, notwithstanding he may be sanctified by inward grace, it is perfectly plain he never can be *truly* accounted just by a mere outward righteousness which has never been given to him. Since it is, then, a mysterious fact that man is actually made just no otherwise than by a gift of *inward* grace; so, on the other hand, is it palpable nonsense to suppose that he can be accounted as justified, and considered, at the same time, as destitute of all internal virtue and true justice.

† Their consciences will, undoubtedly, accuse them rightly of

and pronounce them righteous. How? because they are righteous in themselves? No; but because Christ's merits are imputed to them, who is therefore said 'to be made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him,'* (2 Cor. v. 21) How was Christ made sin for us? Not by our sins inherent in him—that is horrid blasphemy;† but by our sins imputed to him—*that is true divinity.* (!) And as he was made sin for us, not by the inhesion of our sins in him, but by the imputation of our sins to him, so are we made the righteousness of God in him by the imputation of his righteousness to us, not by the inhesion of his righteousness *in us.* He was accounted as a sinner, and *therefore* (!) *punished* for us; we are accounted as righteous, and therefore glorified in him." "And thus we are accounted as righteous in him, *as he was accounted as a sinner* for us. He was accounted as a sinner for us, and, therefore, he was condemned: we are accounted as righteous in him; and so we are justified. And *this* is the right notion of justification, as distinguished from sanctification." (!)

And thus Bishop Beveridge affirms it to be "true divinity" to hold that we are accounted just in the *very same judicial manner* and by *the same law of condemnation* by which Christ "was," as *he* maintains, "accounted as a sinner." But is it, we ask, any thing less, to use his own words, than "horrid blasphemy," to make and defend so vain a declaration? For, as it is obvious that He was considered simply as a substituted or vicarious offering for sin, how preposterous is it to assert that He was, *in any sense*, accounted as a sinner!

many things in which they have offended, and it is, therefore, worse than useless, or rather, sheer trifling, to refer to the testimony of "the Devil," for that purpose; but neither will God, nor can any creature whatever with truth, pronounce the elect to be righteous by a law which has *already condemned* us. And hath not God, moreover, distinctly made known to us throughout the whole of his written revelation, that "by the works of the law no flesh shall be justified?"

* "The righteousness of God *in him*," then, is a direct contradiction to the assertion of an imputed and justifying righteousness without him; or to the illusive notion of a "double or two-fold righteousness," as Hooker terms it; consisting, according to him, of one kind for a legal imputation without, and another kind for a spiritual infusion within; thus reckoning the first for justifying without sanctifying, and the latter for sanctifying without justifying!

† And how far short of blasphemy is it to affirm that we are accounted just by the very same law through which he was put to death as our substitute, instead of our being so accounted by the merits only of his own righteousness, and the purchased gifts of his atonement?

Adam, without question, was justly accounted by the law as a sinner; but no hypothetical argument of this nature can ever, for a moment, be admitted in the case of the Son of God. He was truly made a curse and a sin-offering, and, moreover, most maliciously and unjustly accounted by wicked men as a sinner; but the very law itself by which he was put to death, testified to the contrary, and confounded them with shame. Even the heathen centurion bore approved evidence to the falsity of such a revolting imputation. But notwithstanding that all Scripture, the holy law itself, nay, even the voice of nature speaking through the Roman soldier, indignantly repels the thought that the Son of God could, in *any wise*, be accounted as a sinner, it is, nevertheless, held by Bishop Beveridge that "we are," to repeat his own words, "accounted as righteous in him, as he was accounted *as a sinner* for us." (!)

Again, Bishop Beveridge says, that when we are made righteous or just *in ourselves*, (!) as he says we are by the infusion of grace within, then are we *not accounted* righteous; for this, according to him, would interfere, in the one case, with our accounted righteousness by the merits of Christ, and, in the other, with the infusion of grace through the agency of the Spirit. For, unless this distinction were strictly preserved, it would, according to him, be an entire abandonment of the cardinal feature of the Protestant faith, in its *judicial* imputation to man of the mere external merits of the atonement.

And this doctrine, such as is maintained by Bishop Beveridge, is also called, by Protestantism itself, "true divinity," and true imputation, agreeably to the reformed faith, viz. "that Christ was accounted as a sinner, and *therefore* punished for us," notwithstanding that He is ever spoken of in the inspired volume in no other way than as "holy, innocent, undefiled, separated from sinners;" and when it is, in fact, nothing short of blasphemy to consider him otherwise than as an unspotted victim, an immaculate offering, and a holy sacrifice for the sins of the world. Such, then, is the fatal consequence of the doctrine of a legal imputation, which, not content with its denial of the sacramental and inward matter of baptism, and of the sacred substance of the Eucharist itself,

even "*accounts*" the holy and unspotted victim of the cross "*as a sinner!*" And while some, moreover, retain the *names* of sacrament, of altar, and of priest, they, in like manner, reject their blessed substance, as "a blasphemous superstition of Romish transubstantiation." Thus, while they ostensibly hold the forms of faith, do they vainly reject their sacred matter and their "holy thing."

Now it is never to be forgotten, in the argument, that both Catholics and Protestants agree in their professions that we are justified by faith and the righteousness of Christ. This, then, is not the actual difference or the turning point of the controversy between them; but it consists *in the mode and manner* of imputing to man the merits of the justice by which he is accepted, and the *meaning* which they respectively annex to the righteousness which is accounted. The Catholic says it is no less than blasphemy to impute to *us* the righteousness by which God alone is righteous in himself. But the Protestant, on the other hand, maintains that this, only, is the righteousness which is imputed to man for justification. The question, therefore, between them, is not whether we are justified by faith, but what is the kind or sort of faith which enters into the account, and what is the way by which the merits of Christ are truly imputed.

Now, the "true divinity" and "right notion of (Protestant) justification" on this point is, according to Bishop Beveridge, that we are accounted as righteous in Christ, in the same way or manner "as he was accounted as a sinner for us."—And here let not the reader suppose that this is only or merely the private opinion or notion of Bishop Beveridge. It is, in fact, the Protestant system itself of "imputed righteousness," and so maintained by every divine* in the English Church, as well as by every other sect in Christendom. Indeed, to hold the reverse of such an imputation of the merits of Christ, extraordinary as it may appear, is branded by all Protestant writers on the subject, as the leading impiety of "Anti-

* With the exception, perhaps, of the learned Bishop Bull, who, with a Catholic conviction on this point, remained, nevertheless, within the Protestant communion.

christ," or "the man of sin," and of "the mother of abominations." But the great majority, it must be acknowledged, of Protestants, whether divines or laymen, are *most singularly ignorant* as to what is really the Catholic doctrine on this point, or, indeed, on any other article of its most holy and most Christian faith. This, however, is not to be wondered at, since the watchword in relation to it, is, with them all, "touch not, taste not, handle not."

But, *by whom*, we would ask, do the Protestant confessions mean to affirm that Christ was accounted as a sinner? Do they actually mean to hold that he was so accounted by his Father, and that this was really so said by God at any time; or do they intend that Protestants only so account it for the justification of their own faith? It is plain, that whatever may be the answer to this question, whatever may be the meaning of pious individuals on the subject, the thing itself can be justly called by no other name than that of blasphemy. As such, it is most righteously sealed with an anathema by the Council of Trent,* while it is obvious, also, that such an imputation

* The anathema of the Council, it is to be noted, is not against the imputation of the justice of Christ, as most Protestant writers contend, but against their own fatal doctrine of its *mere* imputation, to the exclusion of inward grace and charity.

Bellarmine, moreover, expressly shows that, although the phraseology of imputation is not common among the Fathers, the Church has never objected to its use, save only in the Protestant sense, and that she uniformly supports the principle, according to her own catholic and apostolic traditions, in that the justice of Jesus Christ is really and effectually imputed, whenever it is actually communicated by the grace and infusion of his Holy Spirit.—I. ii. *de justif. cap.* vii. *Vide et Sess.* vi. *cap.* vii. *de justif. Con. Trid. Also Bishop Kenrick on Justification, Chap.* ix. *on Imputed Justice, passim.* In one place he remarks as follows: "Our objections are (only) against the *mere* imputation, as we believe that the merits of Christ are *effectually imputed* to us, and that real justice is mercifully communicated by God, 'whereby he makes us just, gifted wherewith we are renewed in the spirit of our mind, and not only are accounted just, but are called such, and are just in reality, receiving justice in us, each one according to the measure which the Holy Ghost imparts to each, according to his good pleasure, and according to the peculiar disposition and co-operation of each.'" —*Sess.* vi. *cap.* vii. *de justif. Con. Trid.*—(Ibid, p. 99.)

Again, in alluding to the difference which exists between Protestantism and the Catholic faith, on this matter, he says, "To pre-

was, in the days of our blessed Lord's humiliation, the charge only of his misguided enemies, who reckoned the unspotted victim among transgressors and malefactors, and that, in open defiance of the voice of the Father himself, declaring from heaven, "this is my beloved Son, hear ye him." But, according to Bishop Beveridge, as Christ was accounted a sinner, so are we, therefore, justified by faith, or accounted as righteous. While it is held, also, in the articles of the English church, that our justification by faith only, on this acknowledged principle and mode of Protestant imputation, "is a wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort," it is, according to Catholic imputation, considered, on the other hand, as the most dangerous of all the delusions to which the weakness of our fallen nature is liable.

Again, Bishop Beveridge distinguishes between a making of our natures holy by the Spirit of Christ, and an accounting of *our persons* as righteous by the merit of Christ. Strange, however, as is this distinction, we are not surprised at the declaration, for it is a necessary consequence of the forensic imputation, and directly opposed to the Catholic imputation of the atonement, as held by the Church in all ages; whether during her primitive state, in the times of her first apostles, or in those of the fathers of Trent, or by their successors in the ministry at the present day.

This same imputation also of the merits of Christ to the persons of men, as held by Bishop Beveridge, is explicitly avowed, in the same manner, in the Westminster Confession of Faith;* wherein it is expressly said that

sent a proper view of the question at issue, it should be narrowed to this point: nominal justification by the *extrinsic imputation* of the righteousness of Christ—real justification by the *intimate* application of his merits to our souls."—(Ibid, p. 103.)

Bossuet observes as follows: "Qui de nous n'a pas toujours cru et enseigné que Jesus Christ avoit satisfait surabondamment pour les hommes, et que le Père éternal, content de cette satisfaction de son Fils, nous traitoit aussi favorablement que si nous eussions nousmêmes satisfait á sa justice? Si on ne veut dire cela, quand on dit que la justice de Jesus Christ nous est *imputée*, c'est une chose *hors de doute*, et il ne falloit pas troubler tout l'univers, ni prendre le titre de Réformateurs pour *une doctrine si connue et si avouée*."—*Histoire des Variations*, l. iii. § xxxiv.

* Confession of Faith. Chap. xi.

men are not accepted as righteous "for any thing wrought in them," nor by "imputing faith itself," "as their righteousness,"* but by "accounting and accepting their persons as righteous."(!) The same kind of imputation is also maintained in the confession of the Synod of Dort.†

Should it be maintained, however, by any advocate of the Anglican Church, that such a doctrine as the above, however it may be held by the other sects, is with her not a matter *de fide;* to this we can only reply, that it is the necessary and unavoidable consequence of the Protestant system of a forensic imputation, or, in other words, of a legal and personal rule of faith. For if it be held that the merits of Christ are accounted to us, according to the law of works, which is the necessary and avowed principle of the Protestant reform, it "follows, as the night the day," that the merits of Christ must then be accounted to *the persons* of men, and not to their new natures by the faith of the Church in the sanctification of her faithful offspring. And if a legal imputation excludes of necessity the infusion of an inward and spiritual grace, as all its advocates unite in affirming, the Protestant faith, it is evident, should it ever shrink from

* Now respecting the father of the faithful, are we, indeed, told that it was *his person* which was accepted as righteous, or, that *his faith* was accounted as righteousness? See Rom. iv. In what part, moreover, of the sacred volume is it, we ask, to be found, that God accepts the persons of men, but *not* their faith itself?

† The latter, on this point, also argue as follows: "Therefore we justly say with Paul, that we are justified by faith alone, or by faith without works. However, to *speak more clearly, we do not mean* (!) that *faith itself* justifies us, for it is only an instrument (or a *bare naked* hand, as Usher calls it,) with which we embrace Christ our Righteousness." Article xxii. But would not their meaning, we ask, be more clearly expressed by saying distinctly that Christ alone justifies without faith as well as without works? For with their system of absolute and unconditional election, we really cannot perceive the necessity of requiring faith in any manner. And since their *meaning* is, that *faith itself* does *not* justify, and that good works also have no justifying merit, is it not natural, we ask, that many of their disciples should imagine, as did some of the immediate followers of Luther, that "good works were an impediment to salvation?" For Mosheim informs us that "Amsdorf, (a strict disciple of Luther,) was so transported and infatuated by his excessive zeal for the doctrine of Luther, as to maintain *that good works were an impediment to salvation.*"—(*Mosheim, Eccles. His., Cent.* xvi. *Sec.* 2. *part* 2.

an explicit acknowledgment of the acceptance of persons as the only justifying merit of the atonement, must, in that case, entirely exclude the doctrine of justification from her confession.

HOOKER.

We proceed now to cite the testimony of the celebrated Hooker, in relation to the great cardinal principle of the Protestant faith. "Of honored names," says Dr. Hook, "the Church of England holds none more highly in honor than that of the *judicious* Hooker."*

In the same strain of eulogy he elsewhere proceeds, in adopting the language of Wordsworth, in relation to the merits of Hooker's testimony in behalf of the principles of the English Reformation.

"Hooker," he says, "may justly be regarded as the genuine lineal descendant of the most enlightened English Reformers; and possessing learning equal to any of them, with more opportunities of meditation and the accumulated advantage of their labors and experience, he may, perhaps not improperly, be considered as exhibiting in his writings a model of the true, settled, most approved, mature and Catholic principles of the *English* Reformation."†

In the view, then, of this distinguished authority of the English Church, the denial of the doctrine of a legal imputation by the Catholic Church is, according to him, considered as her worst and most striking deformity. In regard to the imputation, as taught by her, of the merits of the Cross, through the gift of an inward and spiritual grace, he says, "If there were no other leaven in the lump of their doctrine but this, this were sufficient to prove that their doctrine is not agreeable to the foundation of Christian faith." "It perverts," he also says, "the truth of Christ," is "an adversary to his merits," and "overthroweth the foundation of the faith." Indeed, throughout the whole of his exposition of the doctrines

* Call to Union, p. 70.
† Wordsworth's Biography, iv. 269.

of the English Church he explicitly avows the principle of a legal imputation, and as pointedly rejects the infusion of an inward grace or righteousness for the office of justifying.

In opposition also to the Catholic doctrine, which holds the utter impossibility of our having any participation in Christ by "pieces," or fractional portions, or, in other words, by any conceivable mode whatever of division, Hooker maintains, in his Ecclesiastical Polity, as follows:

"Thus *we* participate Christ, partly by imputation, as when those things which he did and suffered for us, are imputed unto us for righteousness; partly by habitual and real infusion, &c. That wherein we are partakers of Jesus Christ by imputation consisteth in such acts and deeds of his, as could not have longer continuance than while they were in doing, nor at that very time belong unto any other but to him from whom they come;* and therefore, how men, either then, or before, or since, should be made partakers of them, *there can be no way imagined, but only by* (i. e. mere) *imputation.*"†

Now we trust that sufficient has been said to show that it is only in an imaginary way that such a fallacious or absurd imputation could possibly be conceived or thought of. And we cite the passage merely for the purpose of exhibiting another authentic illustration of "the grand Protestant doctrine of imputative righteousness."

In his discourse also on justification, in speaking of the justified man, he says, God "accepteth him in Jesus Christ as perfectly righteous, as if he had fulfilled (i. e. according to the letter) all that was commanded him in the law." Nay, "more perfectly righteous than if himself had fulfilled the whole law."

But is it not self-evident that, by holding such a tenet, we actually account the creature to be *more* righteous than his Maker, who, alone, in Christ, has fulfilled the law *according to its letter*, and which could be done by no other? And what greater trifling can it be, to reply by saying, that this is not actually so meant, but only and simply so accounted, as *if it were* the fact!

To the above, Hooker adds the following caution, "I

* Quite a sufficient reason, we should think, why these personal acts of our Head, can never, in truth, be attributed to the members. † Eccl. Pol., § 56.

must take heed what I say: but the Apostle saith, 'God made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.'" And from this text he argues in favor of the Protestant doctrine of imputation, in the same manner as we before noticed in our citations from Bishop Beveridge; viz. that, in order to our being accounted righteous, it was necessary that Christ should be accounted *as a sinner!** O tell it not in Gath! Publish it not in the streets of Askelon!

Well might Hooker exclaim, "I must take heed what I say;" nevertheless, he adds, in the sentence immediately following the last quoted, "Let it be counted folly, or frenzy, or fury, whatsoever, it is our comfort and our wisdom: we care for no knowledge in the world but this, that man hath sinned and God hath suffered: that God hath made himself the son of man, and that men are made the righteousness of God." But still the question recurs, how, or by what rule, does he reckon his "comfort" and his "wisdom" in this knowledge? By the law? or by the promise of inherent grace? It is based, he tells us, on the principle by which, agreeably to his own interpretation, and that of the English church, the external righteousness of Christ is imputed to us by a sentence of the law. Now, is it not manifest, that if it be according to the law, it cannot then be according to the promise, since such an accounting necessarily makes the promise void? And, moreover, if it be not of the promise, then is it not of grace, and our faith, consequently, is as vain, in that case, as the imputation itself, upon which the whole system of this imaginary salvation is made to depend.

The whole ground of his glorying, then, and the foundation of his "comfort" and "wisdom" "in this knowledge," consists in the virtue of the law, and through which he maintains his freedom from the Catholic justi-

* It is plain that the wicked rulers of the synagogue counted him as a sinner, but no one can show that his holy church, blessed as she is with the promise of his perpetual guidance, ever accounted him in any other manner than as "one tempted in all things like as we are, yet without sin."—(Heb. iv. 15.)

fication according to the power only of *an inherent* and spiritual grace.

"You see, therefore," he proceeds, "that *the Church of Rome, in teaching justification by inherent grace,* doth pervert the truth of Christ; and that, by the hands of the Apostles, *we* have received otherwise than she teacheth."* Now, by the hands of Apostles, has the Catholic

* But independently of the absurdity, not to say impiety of this doctrine, which carries with it its own contradiction, how, we ask, could the ministers of the Protestant establishment in England receive it through the tradition of Christ's Apostles, when the former not only disclaim the divine authority of that tradition, but, at the same time, find it impossible to deny that their religion, along with the rest of Protestantism, *originated at the Reformation?* Hence, it would follow, in the absence of parliamentary evidence, (by the way, so abundant and conclusive on this head,) that their establishment *as a church,* whatever be the claims of their high church party, was founded neither by Christ nor by any one of his Apostles. It is certain that none of them can deny, unless in the face of all historical testimony, that Luther was *the first* Protestant, or that the name was *first* given to *him and his disciples.* Dr. Evans relates that "The Tricentennial Anniversary of the Reformation was, in 1817, celebrated by *churchmen* and dissenters."—(*Sketch of the Denominat.*) The Reformed religion, therefore, is now just 325 years old, while its surname of Protestantism was given within a few years less.

And again, is it not, we ask, the height of presumption in Hooker, to affirm that the English Church, of which he was a minister under the spiritual supremacy of its Head in his own dominions, received this authority of teaching the doctrine he contends for by a commission from *the Apostles?* Was not the name most commonly given to the Church of England always that of the *Established Church*—an elliptical phrase for the *Church established by law?* This, without dispute, ever was, and ever will be, its true, proper, and distinctive name. It is not pretended, in the actual history of the country, that it was founded by Christ, or by his Apostles—but *by law,* that is, by acts of Parliament.

The following is copied from a recently published "History of the Protestant Reformation," &c., edited by the Rev. H. Smith. "Now the act of Parliament which confers on Henry VIII. the spiritual supremacy of the Church in his own dominions, is the first of a series of acts of Parliament, which comprise the beginning, the progress, and the final settlement of the religion established by law in this country. It is the first and most important act, inasmuch as the foundation is always the most important part of the edifice. In the year, therefore, of our Lord, 1534, King Henry VIII. and his Parliament—not Christ, nor any one of his Apostles, nor any one of his Apostles' successors—but King Henry VIII. and his Parliament, marked out the boundary, and laid the foundation stone of the New Church of England. Here, then, is

Church received the unity of her faith in such a manner that, *for her*, it is absolutely impossible to make such an unholy severance in the graces of justification and sanctification, as is attempted by Hooker and the reformers, in this denial of their identity in substance, and in thus distinguishing them as two different principles, or formal causes of our salvation. And it is evident, also, by the plainest declarations of Scripture, that they are only diverse operations and ministrations of one and the same Spirit, having the same end and substance in the one Body which upholds all truth, and whose heaven-born and catholic unity in all things, is its conservative principle, and its effectual shield against the least perversion of its faith or doctrine. But "St. Paul," he says, "doth plainly sever these two parts (or kinds*) of Christian righteousness one from the other." What! St. Paul sever that which God hath joined together through an everlasting covenant in his own body! Hooker, nevertheless, quotes from Scripture in support of his assertion, as follows:—"For," he continues, "in the sixth to the Romans thus he (St. Paul) writeth, 'Being freed from

a public and notorious fact, which is proclaimed by act of Parliament, and which stands recorded in the statute book of these realms to this day, and which no one who is not ready, with the ancient Pyrrhonists, to deny his own existence, can call in question.

"In the year 1534, and in the 26th year of the reign of Henry VIII., after the *Church of Christ*, 'built upon the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone,' had been established 1501 years, (that is, from our Lord's death in the year 33 of the Christian era,) is commenced the *New Religion* of the Established Church in this country. Here we have the birth, and the day of the birth, of the child, called by the fond name of *Reformation* in these realms, and which child was younger sister to the *Reformation* on the continent."—(P. 65.)

Again, while Hooker, as above, informs us that the English Church owes its authority and teaching to the Apostles, Blackstone (in his Commentaries, Book IV.) says, "The clergy of the Church of England look up to *the King* as their *head*, to the Parliament as their *lawgiver*, and pride themselves in nothing more justly, than in being true members of the *Church emphatically by law established*." Its Head and its Lawgiver may, therefore, rightfully say to its clergy—

"*Sic volo, sic jubeo, stat pro ratione voluntas.*"

* As he elsewhere calls them in the following sentence—"There be two kinds of Christian righteousness."

sin, and made servants to God, ye have your fruit in holiness.' " On this text he reasons, that to *free us from sin* is *one kind* of righteousness, and *to give us holiness* is *another kind* of righteousness; because by him the first is accounted to us only according to the sentence and letter of the law, but the second is given only according to the Spirit of Sanctification. Now the law, we know, came by Moses, and is ended in Christ, by whom grace and truth came, and by whom they reign, and must for ever reign in the unity of his mediatorial righteousness, of which He only is the author and finisher in his own Body, which is the Church of the living God.

But these "Christian righteousnesses" must, he insists, be preserved in their distinctive integrity—must be kept apart "one from the other;" for the first, he says, is *merely* accounted, but the second is actually given;—the one *barely* outward, the other truly within—the former accepted as "*more* perfectly righteous than if the man himself had (literally) fulfilled the whole law"—the latter inherent in us as a work of *our own* in the fruit of holiness—"*and so*," concludes Hooker, "the end of *both* is everlasting life." (!) The one righteousness, he says, "St. Paul doth prove, by the example of Abraham," to be ours "by faith without works." The *other* righteousness St. James, he says, by the same example also proves to be ours, not by "faith without works," but by works with faith. But, as St. James expressly says that "faith without works is dead," it still remains to be proved how this notion of the first righteousness can be maintained on the ground of a *dead* faith. The Patriarch of the reformation, it appears, could not, to *his* satisfaction, reconcile the writing of St. Paul with that of St. James, and, therefore, he boldly pronounced the latter to be "an epistle of straw."

And this "severance," moreover, of the unity of "Christian righteousness," which Hooker maintains that both St. Paul and St. James "doth prove by Abraham's example," is, he tells us, the doctrine of the English Church, she having thus "received" it "by the hands of *the Apostles*," (*!!*) being altogether opposed to the catholic unity or "mystery," as he elsewhere terms it, of the Roman faith by a righteousness within.

Now, whatever may be the opinion of Hooker, that this distinctive view of the English Church was received through the teaching of St. Paul, or by the hands of the Apostles, we can only say that St. Paul and the Catholic Church, through the laying on of the Apostolic hands, do expressly teach that the above-named graces of justification and sanctification are only different operations of *one and the same faith*, diversities of *one and the same gift* of righteousness—inherent workings of one and the same Spirit and Lord, distributing to every one as He will, for the building up of his own Body in the unity of its truth and perfection.

How different is all this from the imputation of a righteousness without!—a doctrine which accounts our most holy faith to be nothing more than a mere abstract quality of human opinion—a bare empty virtue of our own—"a physical righteousness,"*—a mere nominal thing of no intrinsic merit—or "nothing worth," as Archbishop Usher says of it, although he adds, that "God hath given it a name above every name." Now, all these contradictions and absurdities are gravely maintained for the avowed purpose of exalting the dignity of Christ, and depressing the merits of his members. But in turning to the pages of the sacred volume, do we always find it to be accounted there, as the same identical faith which justifies, and the same also which sanctifies, through the same healing power of God unto salvation, whose end is eternal life.

The first error, however, of Protestantism, in regard to its imputative system, lies in its unholy severance of faith from its Christian and Apostolic unity in works of charity; and the next, by a necessary consequence, in its confounding the *absolute* righteousness of God with the mediatorial justice of his Incarnate Son. Accordingly, Hooker considers an imputation to us of the former, as the only one (in Protestant nomenclature) of the "Christian righteousnesses" which is necessary "to make a wicked and a sinful man *most* holy through his believing," and which, he adds, "is more than to create

* Vide Bishop Hopkins on the Doctrine of the Two Covenants. —Works, Vol. 2, p. 382.

a *world of nothing*."(*!*) For his doctrine not only accounts the man as accepted, but even "*more* (*!*) perfectly righteous than if himself had fulfilled the whole law," and that even before his sanctification, and without the presence of an inward grace, or the infusion of a spiritual substance.

But the Church of Rome, he says, so confounds the grand and important distinction between justification and sanctification, as to make them identical in their principle; and thus, according to him, in her corrupt doctrine, she destroys the very essence of gospel truth and Christian purity. This very distinction, moreover, he rightly considers as *the key* to the whole of the controversy with the Catholic Church on the mode of imputing to renewed man the merits of our Redeemer's justice. In his words, "it openeth the way to the *understanding* of *that grand question* which hangeth yet in controversy between us and the Church of Rome." It is a distinction, certainly, which the latter utterly rejects, while, by all the various churches of the Protestant reform, it has ever been strenuously defended as the fundamental principle of the Christian faith.

In regard to these "two kinds of Christian righteousness," "we ourselves," he continues, "do not teach Christ alone, excluding our *own* faith, (unto justification.") True, for he magnifies "*our own* faith," or the *bare* and *mere* believing act, as he elsewhere calls it, of the creature himself, as the distinctive and just ground by which he is accepted, and by which the "*absolute*" (*!*) righteousness of God is accounted to the persons of sinful men. Neither does he exclude "our own works," or *our own* righteousness unto sanctification.* On the contrary, he expressly maintains, that both "the one" and "the other" are indispensably necessary to our salvation (!) Still, however, he insists that, without the *imputation to us* of the "*absolute*" righteousness of God, "the weakness of our *faith* were cause sufficient to make us *culpable*, yea, to *shut us from* the kingdom of heaven, where nothing that is not *absolute* can enter." (! !)

"It is a childish cavil," he continues, "wherewith in

* See Hooker on Justification, § 31.

the matter of justification our adversaries do so greatly please themselves, exclaiming that we tread all Christian virtues under our feet, and require nothing in Christians but faith; because we teach that *faith alone* justifieth; whereas, by this speech, we never meant to exclude either hope or charity from being always joined as inseparable mates with faith in the man that is justified, or works from being added as necessary duties," &c., &c. True, he means not to exclude these things from the *nomenclature* of his imputed system of "faith alone." For let it be noted, that the objection of his adversaries is *not* that he "requires nothing in Christians but faith;" but *it is*, that the kind of faith which he requires is not scriptural faith—is not the living faith which St. James describes as *justifying by its works*, and St. Paul, as being opposed to *our own works*, or, in other words, the unprofitable "deeds of the law."

The question, then, still recurs, what is the meaning which Hooker annexes to his terms, and how, or in what sense, does he account the things which he says are necessary to our salvation? Why, he first accounts our most holy faith *as our own faith;* secondly, the works of Christian holiness as "*our own works;*" and finally, he accounts to us *as ours*, the *absolute* and *essential* righteousness of the Godhead, to which no man or creature can approach, and which no creature either "hath seen or can see."

Again, of these accounted things, he says, "Every of these I have proved by the testimony of God's own mouth; therefore, I conclude that faith, (viz. our own faith,) is that which maketh us most holy, in consideration whereof it is called, in this place, our *most holy faith.*"*(!)

Respecting Hooker's discourse on justification, to which we have so frequently referred, the Rev. W. Fitzgerald† remarks that,

"It was written upon a most important occasion, under circumstances which rendered it necessary to bestow the most careful consideration upon every word, was elaborated with the utmost

* Hooker's 2d sermon on St. Jude.

† See his work on "Episcopacy, Tradition, and the Sacraments."

sedulity, and transcribed by the author himself, for the purpose of having it attentively examined by his friends." And "in the very latest legacy which he bequeathed to the Church, the Fragment of a reply to 'The Christian Letter,' (vol. ii. p. 700, of Keble's edition,) he has incorporated an abstract of this very sermon, and repeated, almost in the same words, his former professions of belief in the imputation of Christ's righteousness, &c."

Should we now ask of the advocates of Protestantism what is meant by "our own faith," according to their manner of speaking, and whether this means that faith is considered by them simply as mere human faith, or mere opinion, or a mere act of the human mind, or property of the understanding, what would be the answers to such a question? Would not every sect of Protestantism unite with Archbishop Usher, and say, that faith, or what they term "our own faith," is but a *poor and mean act—of nothing worth—a bare and empty hand?* But we must not omit the qualification which is added—i. e. while, or at the moment when it is said to justify, or to be in its justifying office. And should we further ask of Protestantism whether it has any other office besides that of justifying, the answer doubtless would be that it sanctifies also; but only after, and when it has completed its former and grandest work. Now if these are the *offices* of faith, viz. to justify and to sanctify, what, we ask, is *faith itself?* Is this a *mere act* of man, prior to the infusion of grace? Or is it *at all times* a divine power? Or is it the former only when it justifies, and then *changes* into the latter when it sanctifies; a poor and mean virtue (as it is called) in the former case, and a just and holy one only in the latter? If so, then, *its identity* is destroyed, and it ceases of necessity to be one and the same faith; since it cannot be a poor and empty virtue at one time, and a holy one at another, nor yet worthless or "of nothing worth" at both one and the same time.

But perhaps it may be said, that the admission of Archbishop Usher, of its being a virtue, (although a poor and empty one as he maintains it to be,) is, on his part, but a carelessness of expression, and that he did not actually mean by it what it ordinarily signifies, since it is no virtue at all, but, as others more properly affirm, a *mere act* only, and therefore not a power in the justified.

Still, however, it might be argued, on Protestant grounds, that this is to be understood as limited only to its justifying office, for when it assumes the office of sanctifying, then it changes from a mere act, and becomes a real and holy power in the man, but which, be it remembered, takes place only when it ceases to justify.

Let it not be thought, however, that the above is only an imaginary or hypothetical statement of Protestant reasoning on the subject of what its followers call gospel faith. It is, we repeat, the very principles of their system of *faith alone*, and the natural fruit of their universally accepted doctrine of a legal or judicial imputation. But after what we have already remarked on the above reasoning, it is hardly necessary, we think, to attempt its further refutation, or expose its flagrant contradictions. We shall, therefore, content ourselves with saying, that the Catholic Church acknowledges no other faith than the one immutable power of God unto salvation in all the entireness of its sacred unity, and in all the varied exercise of its offices, and in all the manifold wisdom of its diversified operations. The juridical imputation, therefore, of Protestantism by the letter of the law, being contrary to the faith of Christ, is pronounced by his living Body as another gospel, and consequently sealed with anathema by the solemn canons of her authoritative Councils.

The fundamental principle of Protestantism on the nature of Christian justice, we may truly say, consists in the teaching of its imputation in an exclusively legal and external manner. And this view, as we have seen, is zealously sustained by the most distinguished divines of the English Church, not excepting those to whom the Oxford writers appeal as among its "wisest rulers and doctors." Bishop Andrews, in particular, most emphatically remarks, that "we shall never take the state of the question aright unless we consider it in this view." In regard to the sentiments of the Oxford writers respecting Bishop Andrews, see Tract, No. 71, p. 26. The hypothesis, indeed, of imputing to us the justice of Jesus Christ in a forensic or judicial sense, appears to be a peculiar and characteristic mark of every religious denomination in separation from the Holy See. According to the same

theory, also, do they all contend for the apostolic meaning of the scriptural term of justification; but whether their rule be applied to determine the sense of the latter, or that of imputation, the error, in either case, is the same.*

Let it suffice, therefore, to say, that as faith *itself* is not even acknowledged in this system, as a supernatural power in the justified man, so also is its very existence rendered void by the imaginary process of a legal imputation.

By a parity of reasoning, moreover, do the Protestant sects now advocate their respective claims to their being *branches*, as they term themselves, of the Church Catholic. For while they vainly endeavor to support their ideal scheme of independent branches, to which in fancy they so vainly cling, they appear, at the same time, to be insensible to the necessity of presupposing the unity of a living tree, as essential to their very existence. And as the tree of life also can have no connection with branches that are not of heavenly origin, so the power of faith itself knows of no acts, no opinions, no offices of any kind which are only of human origin or of mere creature growth. But the fundamental theory of Protestantism pays no regard to the essential and necessary distinctions of the Christian revelation. It seems to have been entirely forgotten by its authors, that our most holy faith is a gift to us of our Lord himself, through the substance of

* In reference to the above, we quote the following from our "Remarks on the Oxford Theology:"

"If it be not denied that justification is a work of Almighty grace, in behalf of a fallen and condemned creature, it will, we think, be readily acknowledged that the import of the term, as used in the sacred volume, cannot possibly be illustrated by any of the analogies of a court or tribunal of law; and that its scriptural meaning cannot, with the slightest propriety, be received in a forensic or judicial sense. We think, moreover, we may be warranted in affirming that one of the principal difficulties which have so much obscured the illustration of this fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith, may be ascribed to the strikingly erroneous sense in which writers have employed this consecrated term. In the consideration, therefore, of this subject, we do not see how any clear and precise views can be obtained, unless the idea of a court or tribunal of law, in connection with its forms, its officers, and its attendant circumstances, are carefully excluded from our minds." —"*Remarks on the O. T.*" p. 79.

his mysterious humanity. And although this, in his adorable person, is ever united to the incommunicable essence of the Godhead, yet are the two mysterious substances perpetually confounded in every scheme or theory which seeks to support a legally imputed doctrine of mere human opinion and mere human authority.*

BISHOP ANDREWS.

We proceed now to notice the views of Bishop Andrews on the imputative system of the Protestant reformation. He is usually designated in the English Church by the name of Holy Andrews, and the Oxford writers call him in their language, "one of our wisest doctors and rulers."†

He says that "in the Scripture there is a *double* righteousness set down, both in the Old and in the New Testament. In the Old, and in the very first place that righteousness is named in the Bible: 'Abraham believed, and it was *accounted* unto him for righteousness.' A righteousness *accounted!* And again, (in the very next line,) it is mentioned, 'Abraham will teach his house to do righteousness.' A righteousness *done!* In the New Testament likewise. The former in one chapter (Rom. iv.) no fewer than eleven times; *Reputatum est illi ad justitiam*—'It is accounted to him for righteousness.' A *reputed* righteousness! The latter in St. John—'He that *doeth* righteousness, is righteous.' A righteousness *done!* Of these, the latter, philosophers themselves conceived and acknowledged; the other is proper to Christians only, and altogether unknown in philosophy. The one is a quality of the party; the other an act of the Judge, declaring or pronouncing righteous. The one, ours by influence *or infusion;* the other, by account or imputation. That both these there are, there is no question."‡

* The absurdity, therefore, of the idea of independent branches is no less striking than that of the *invisibility* of a Catholic body, whose existence is not only acknowledged by all to be here on earth, as well as in heaven, but is also admitted, by the advocates of its exclusive invisibility, to be the temple of the living God, and "a city that is set upon a hill," and which therefore "cannot be hid," or concealed from our sight. † Tract, No. 71.

‡ Andrews' Sermons, pp. 724—726.

Now " of these two righteousnesses" as he calls them, " the question is," he says, which is the one " that will stand against *the law*, or conscience, Satan, sin, the gates of hell and the power of darkness ; and so stand that we may be delivered by it from death, despair, and damnation, and entitled by it to life, salvation, and happiness eternal?" This question he decides in favor " only" of the legally accounted one, as it is called, in contradistinction from the one infused in us by the gift of God. Now *the former* is the righteousness of God, whereby he is righteous in himself, and which, as we have before noticed, it is both absurd and profane to account to any other being whatever, not excepting the highest of all favored creatures, the blessed mother of our Lord himself. The *latter* is the justice of God in Jesus Christ, whereby, according to the Written Word, he is *made* righteousness or justice unto us, and whose name as such is " Jehovah our Justice" or righteousness. Bishop Andrews, however, insists that the former alone is actually accounted to us by God, that " this is the true interpretation of ' Jehovah our Righteousness.' "(!)—and that this, moreover, is imputed to us by a sentence and a judgment of the law !

That there are, indeed, two distinct kinds of righteousness, is most certain ; and that we are most solemnly forbidden also to confound the one with the other, is no less certain. And now what greater confusion can there be than when professed teachers of the truth as it is in Jesus, most gravely assure us, that, since there are, in the words of Bishop Andrews, " two righteousnesses," they are consequently " *both* ours"—that these, moreover, constitute a *double* righteousness, or, in the language of Hooker, that " there be two kinds of *Christian* righteousness ?"(!) We ask now, how it is possible that men, with the creed of St. Athanasius before them in their own adopted liturgy, could so egregiously confound the very substance of Christ's humanity with the very substance of his Godhead ? For let it not be forgotten that they account to the creature, through a supposed sentence of the law, the absolute and incommunicable attribute of the Almighty himself, or, in other words, that which belongs exclusively to Him as " very God" alone, and be-

sides whom there is no other. And, in this manner, also, is the same held to be "ours," in the place of that revealed justice by which he is made unto us "very man," as incarnate of our created substance. Such is the vaunted system which is here emphatically described to us under the remarkable name of a "double righteousness."

Nevertheless, says Bishop Andrews, of these two kinds, "the former *only*" "is righteousness indeed;" "that is it we seek for, if we may find it." But with regard to the latter, which the bishop calls "righteousness infused," this, according to him and Protestant imputation, is altogether insufficient to satisfy the requirements of our offended Judge, and will never "stand against the law, or conscience, Satan, sin, the gates of hell and the powers of darkness." The absolute righteousness of the Godhead, therefore, is to this end, alone and sufficient; while this is held, at the same time, to be accounted to the creature by the very same law under which Christ died, and by which the Scriptures assure us "no flesh shall be justified." Hooker also maintains the necessity of our having the same, in order to obtain "the kingdom of heaven, wherein (according to him) nothing but what is *absolute* can enter."

That there is a justice which belongs essentially and exclusively to God alone, and a justice also with which the creature is endued, through the merits and substance of the man Christ Jesus, as the Lord of all flesh, we presume not to deny. On the contrary, its acknowledgment is indeed a distinctive mark and glory of the Catholic faith. "That both these are," we, too, with Bishop Andrews affirm, "there is no question." But the real matter at issue, we are most carefully to note, is not concerning the fact of their existence. The point then of the controversy respects, in the first place, that particular kind which is accounted to the creature for his salvation, and in the next, the mode or manner of the imputation. Now the Catholic faith maintains the imputation only of the righteousness of Jesus Christ, and that through the merits of his ever blessed atonement; and, in so doing, it rejects, as contrary to the truth of God, the monstrous and profane imputation to the creature of the essential

and absolute justice of the Creator. When, therefore, it is further urged by the advocates of the latter system, that the imputation is not through the grace of God within, but through an alleged or visionary act and sentence of the law without, such imputation we shall invariably find to be rejected by the dogmas of Catholicity as impious perversions and wrestings of the Christian faith to the ruin and destruction of our best and dearest hopes. "And, indeed, to do them (Catholics) no wrong, it is true," says Bishop Andrews, "that at his judgment-seat, so far as it concerneth the satisfaction for sin, and our escaping from eternal death, the Church of Rome taketh this name (viz. Jehovah our Righteousness) aright." But what can he mean by the assertion which immediately follows, viz. that "that term which a great while seemeth harsh unto them, now they find no such absurdity in it; that Christ's righteousness and merits *are* imputed to us?"

On the gross *impiety* of imputed righteousness, in the manner *as it is proposed* to us in the systems of Protestant interpretation, the celebrated Bishop of Meaux remarks as follows:—"As to this doctrine, I very well understand how the death of Jesus Christ and the payment he made to the divine justice of the punishment we owed it, is imputed to us, as you impute to a debtor the payment made by the security for his acquittance. But that the perfect justice fulfilled by our Lord in his life and death, and the *absolute* obedience he rendered to the law, should be imputed to us *in the same sense* that the payment of the surety is imputed to the debtor, is the same as to say, that he discharges us by his justice from the obligation of being good and virtuous;" or, in other words, from the duty of obedience to his commands.—"I understand, however," continues Bossuet, "and very clearly, in *another kind of manner*, what it avails us to have a Saviour whose sanctity is infinite. For thereby I behold *him only* worthy to obtain for us all the graces requisite to make us just. But that we should formally be made just, because Jesus Christ was just; and that his justice should be allowed us, as if he had fulfilled the law *to our discharge*, neither does the Scripture say it, nor can any man of good sense comprehend it.

"By this means, accounting as nothing our interior justice, and that which we practise through grace, they make us all in the main *equally* just, by reason that the justice of Jesus Christ, supposed (or accounted) by them *the only one* that renders us just, is infinite. They, likewise, wrest from the elect of God that crown of justice, which the just Judge reserves for each one in particular, since they suppose (or repute) all to have the same justice, which is infinite." Thus is the absolute justice of our Redeemer, whereby he is just in his Godhead alone, profanely imputed to the creature, while *the only one formal* justice, whereby he renders us inherently just according to his grace, is most ignorantly and impiously denounced, by Hooker and Andrews, and other leading divines of the English Church, as a wicked and blasphemous invention of the Church of Rome. But with respect to the former doctrine, "This," says Archbishop Usher, "*is imputative righteousness as it is in the articles of the Church of England.*"

The point to be proved, says Bossuet again, in reference to the continental synods of the Reformers, (whose system of imputing is the same as that of the above-named English divines,) was, "'That the obedience of Jesus Christ, whereby he fulfilled the whole law in his life and death, is allowed us in order to make us just,' which is called in their formularies the imputation of the active justice. Now, all," he continues, "that could be found in four synods to prove this doctrine, and the imputation of the active justice, by the Scripture, is, that 'the Son of Man did not come to be ministered unto, but to minister,' a text so little adapted to imputed justice, that there is no discovering even to what purpose it was cited. But so it is with these new reformers, provided they name but the word of God with emphasis, and then fling out a text or two, however wide from the purpose, they think to have answered the profession they make of believing nought but Scripture in express terms. The people are dazzled with their big promises, and are not even sensible what a sway the authority of their ministers has over them, though, when all is done, it is by that their assent is determined."*

* History of the Variat., by Bossuet.—Book 12, chap. 34, 35, 36.

To return to Bishop Andrews ; does he, then, we ask, mean to say, that the Catholic Church ever, for a moment, denied that Christ's righteousness and merits are imputed to man for his salvation? If so, he was most grossly ignorant of the Catholic faith. No indeed! it is not the imputation of the justice and the merits of Jesus Christ, which the Catholic Church has ever denied or will deny ; but it is the *Protestant* imputation to us of the *absolute* justice of the Almighty, whereby he is just in himself alone, or in the incommunicable attributes of his own uncreated glory, that the Catholic Church condemns, as contrary to the truth of God in Christ. So far from denying the imputation to us of the justice and merits of Christ, she most distinctly teaches that any sort of their imputation whatever, which is not strictly in accordance with the life-giving communication of his grace within, is no other than a false and carnal reckoning according to the works of the law, and an assumed principle of self-righteousness, vainly invented by man as a substitute for the only real justifying merit that can possibly "stand against the law," &c. ; i. e. the merit of Jesus Christ applied to his renewed followers—the merit of "Jehovah our Justice."

It is not unusual for Protestant writers to refer to an account of the debates in the Council of Trent as given by Father Paul, in order to show that there was a difference of opinion among the members on the proper use of the word "imputation." Now, we will not deny that during the sitting of the Council there may have been some of the members to whom the term "imputation" did "seem harsh unto them," from the shocking abuses and impieties which the arch reformer and his associates had introduced into Christendom under the name and *color* of imputation.

In the above-named history of its proceedings, it is stated, that "Soto, who thoroughly held to the effective sense of justification, said the word *imputation* was most popular and plausible, because it signified, at the first sight, that all should be acknowledged for Christ ; but yet he did ever suspect it, in regard of the bad consequences which the Lutherans did draw from thence ; viz. that this only is sufficient (for justification,) without inherent

righteousness ; that the punishment is abolished together with the guilt ; that there remaineth no place for satisfaction. This admonition begat such a suspicion in the hearers, that there appeared a manifest disposition to condemn the word for heretical, *though reasons were effectually applied to the contrary.*"*

Now, admitting the accuracy of this account, there is nothing in it at variance with the final decree. For this is not directed against the imputation of our Redeemer's merits, but only against that *mere* or vain imputation of them which constitutes *the subtlety* of Luther's system, and the acknowledged and vaunted basis of the Protestant reform.

In relation, moreover, to the argument that there are two kinds of righteousness, we, as has been noticed, deny not the fact. On the contrary, we not only maintain the two,† but we hold most firmly to the sacred inviolability of their distinction. We know that there is an attribute of justice which belongs to the Creator alone, and a justice also which he communicates to the creature through the merits of his crucified Son. We deny, however, that *both* of these are *ours*, as Bishop Andrews insists. The Catholic Church, while she declares it blasphemy to account to us the former, imputes the latter only, and this simply by the gift of faith and the graces of a renewed life. Upon the doctrine which declares that the unspotted Victim for our sins is accounted by

* Paul's Hist. Council of Trent, pp. 199, 200.

† Viz. the incommunicable and essential righteousness of the Godhead, and the infused or inherent righteousness wherewith he justifies his faithful children. But the latter only is the one which is not only imputed, but infused in us as *ours ;* or, in other words, is the only formal cause of our justification in the sight of God, and in the view of his Holy Church triumphant in the heavens above, or still contending with her foes upon the earth beneath. For, as there is but one Christ, and one Lord, and one faith, so is there, also, but one Christian justice, by which we are formally rendered just in the image of God. And it is, therefore, no less *monstrous* to suppose there can be two true faiths, than to suppose there can be two Christian righteousnesses. Still, however, *neither* of the *two*, so called according to Protestant nomenclature, can possibly be imputed to man, as a justifying gift of his Maker ; inasmuch as their first belongs to God alone, and their second, according to Scripture, is the worthless righteousness of the law.

God as a sinner, for the alleged purpose of imputing to us his absolute justice, she pronounces her most holy anathema. And, while we distinctly affirm the existence of the two kinds of divine justice, is it not, we ask, both folly and madness to count the justice of God in Christ as a "double righteousness," or as consisting of two "Christian righteousnesses," according to the nomenclature of Hooker and other English divines? Would it not, moreover, be equally as vain to call our most holy faith a double faith, or to describe the Church of the living God, as a double, or a two-fold body?

Bishop Andrews again says, that, "to do them no wrong, the Church of Rome *now* (!) find no absurdity in the truth 'that Christ's righteousness and merits are imputed to us.'" "*It is true*," he says, "that at his judgment-seat, so far as concerneth the satisfaction for sin, and our escaping from eternal death, the Church of Rome taketh this name (of Jehovah our Righteousness) aright."* Still, we reply, it is *not* true that she interprets this holy name in the same sense with Bishop Andrews. He, indeed, greatly wrongs the Church in alleging that her imputation of the merits of Christ is, *in any respect whatever*, according to the mode and manner of *his* interpretation, or in any degree of harmony with a single principle of the Protestant rule of faith. Bishop Andrews accounts to us the righteousness of Jehovah, by declaring "that it is our righteousness in *the abstract*, and not in the *concrete*." But the Church of Rome, so far from accounting to us such an *abstraction*, (!) holds the imputation to us of the justice of Jesus Christ, in this visionary and hypothetical manner, as one of the grossest absurdities and delusions that has ever enthralled the mind of man. The Church of Rome declares that the absolute righteousness of the invisible and immortal King of kings, is inaccessible to any living creature whatsoever; but that Jehovah our justice, is most truly accounted to us; not, indeed, by an imaginary sentence of the law, but only through the gift of the Son of God—only through the incarnation of the Son of Mary.

Bishop Andrews, however, distinguishes the former as

* Andrews' Sermons, pp. 724—726.

" our righteousness *accounted*," and the latter our " righteousness done." " Of these, the latter," he says, " philosophers themselves conceived and acknowledged ; the other is proper to Christians only, (!) and altogether unknown in philosophy."* But does it not appear incredible, we ask, that Christians only should have conceived and acknowledged so preposterous an imputation to them of the absolute attributes of Divinity, when the very idea itself was inconceivable even to the heathen moralist, and utterly repugnant to every principle of his philosophy ? But, says Bishop Andrews, Christ was made for us "*sin itself* (*!*) in respect of *the guilt.*"(*! !*) " And why this ?" he asks. " To the end," is his reply, " that we might be made, not righteous persons, that was *not full enough*, (*!*) but righteousness itself ; not *every* righteousness, but the very (absolute) righteousness of God himself. What further," he continues, " can be said ; what can be conceived more comfortable ? To have him ours ; not to make us righteous, (for this, according to him, would not be *full enough*,) but to make us righteousness, and that not any other but the (very absolute) righteousness of God."(!)†

Now, can any thing, we ask, be conceived or acknowledged to be more preposterous than such an " imputative righteousness," ascribed *to us*, but which, according to Bishop Andrews, although inconceivable, and unknown to philosophy, " is proper to Christians only ?" " *The wit of man*," he continues, " *can devise no more.*(*!*) And all to this end : that we might see there belongeth a special *Ecce* (*!*) to this *name ;* that there is more than ordinary comfort in it ; that, therefore, we should be careful to honor him with it, and call him by it, ' Jehovah our Righteousness.' " With this admonition we are, also, cautioned that the invaluable benefit is accounted to us, not by an inward gift and infusion of divine grace, but in accordance with the forensic rule of faith, merely by an act or declaration of the Judge pronouncing us to be just or righteous ; nevertheless, at the same time *without actually making us so* in spirit or in truth !

Now, however strenuously this teaching of outward

* Andrews' Sermons, p. 726. † Ibid, 724.

imputation is inculcated in the writings of English Church theologians, and on which point they will be found to be perfectly in accord with the less cautious formularies of the "other denominations," "It is indeed vain," in the language of Bishop Kenrick, "to seek in the writings of the Fathers of the Church any support for a system which owes its origin to the bold spirit of Luther." "St. Augustine," he continues, "so often appealed to by the Reformers on many topics, on which, nevertheless, he is thoroughly Catholic, observes: 'We read that the believer in Christ is justified *in him*, on account of the secret (or inward) *communication and inspiration* of spiritual grace.'"—(*L.* 1, *de pec. mer. et remiss.*) What a decisive testimony is this against the Protestant doctrine of our being justified by an *outward* imputation, and *not by an inward* communication of grace! Bishop Kenrick also makes the following very apposite and striking quotation from St. Augustine in reference to the futility of this vain theory of external imputation. "'What is the justice of God and justice of man? It is called the justice of God, *not whereby God is just*, but which God *gives to man*, that man may be just through God.'"*

He further remarks, that "Calvin has acknowledged that not even Augustine (on this subject) could be followed."†

As Protestants, in general, deny the *infusion* of grace and the fact of an inward or *moral* change in man, for justification, it is curious to notice the Scripture passages they adduce in order to prove their system. Our readers will recollect a remarkable one of this kind, as appealed to by the Continental Reformers, and to which we have adverted in a former page. We beg now to call their attention to another text, by which some writers of eminence in the English Church endeavor to support what they call the *judicial* sense of the term. The passage is from Proverbs, (xvii. 15,) where it is said, agreeably to the Protestant translation, "He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both are an abomination to the Lord." Now, the very fact of their

* Tract xxvi. in Joan.

† Vide Bishop Kenrick on Justification, Chap. ix. p. 109.

having recourse to such a sentence from Holy Writ can, we think, be considered in no other light than as certain evidence of extraordinary infatuation, in respect to their favorite dogma upon the nature of Christian redemption. Who, indeed, could suppose it possible that Protestant writers, distinguished for their learning and talents, could, unless through a blind attachment to theory, appeal to a text where its obvious meaning and application so strikingly condemns the proceeding of an earthly judge in a scandalous justification of wicked men, and that by accounting them to be legally just when he knows or believes them to be legally guilty? Such a decision is, here, most emphatically pronounced to be an abomination in the sight of the Lord, equal to that of condemning the innocent by a perversion of the law. And, as such, moreover, has ever been the accredited sentiment of all civilized nations, is it not, we ask, most strange, that learned writers and doctors should gravely pronounce such an abomination to be a fitting and striking analogy of the conduct of our Maker in *his* justification of our rebellious species?*

* On this subject we quote the following paragraph from our "Remarks on the Oxford Theology." The adversaries of the Church, therefore, in conceiving the above text to support their own view of a judicial or forensic application, "evidently mistake the sense of the passage, in supposing it to mean that God justifies the wicked, as a man may justify his fellow-men; for the expression most plainly refers to the case of one man's justifying another man in his wickedness, which is very different, it must be admitted, from that of God's justification of a sinner. The former relates to a justification of wickedness by man, but the latter is a justification by the Searcher of hearts, who accepts not the person but the faith and penitence of the sinner. It, therefore, simply means that the man who knowingly justifies the wicked in his guilt, and he who condemns those whom he believes to be just, 'even they both are an abomination to the Lord.' The former part coincides with the sentiment as expressed by Publius Syrus, '*Judex damnatur cum nocens solvitur*,' and the latter also applies to a denial of the righteousness of God in changing the heart of the ungodly in his own appointed and gracious way."

We should scarcely have deemed it necessary to have dwelt so long upon the obvious sense of the text referred to, were it not so strangely and tenaciously appealed to by Protestant writers of distinction, in support of another meaning, which, we see, is so diametrically and manifestly opposite.

Bishop Kenrick, on the same subject, remarks that, "To justify

With regard to "the positive justice," says Bishop Andrews, "or that part thereof which is meritorious for reward, there fall they (i. e. the Church of Rome) into a phantasy; they may give it over;" for they "suppose," he continues, "that a righteousness inherent in themselves *without a righteousness that is in Christ* will serve them, whereof they have a good conceit that it will endure God's justice."*

What a calumny is this against the Catholic Church! to charge it with believing or supposing that an inherent righteousness in ourselves, without a righteousness that is in Christ, will serve the requirements of God! No indeed! the Catholic Church cannot imagine such a blasphemous supposition, and nothing but the grossest ignorance of her faith, or wilful blindness to its merits, could possibly charge her with so base an accusation. On the contrary, she accounts the inherent righteousness which is given to her members in their baptism to be no other than the justice of God himself in Christ. Far be it from her to break the unity of the faith; either by a vain and impious imputation to us of what belongs to God alone; or, by an equally presumptuous accounting of the merits of Jesus Christ in his renewed members to be their *own* inherent justice, instead of theirs in Him, and his own in them, through the same one Spirit and Body.

Her faith on this point is most clearly expressed by St. Augustine in the following emphatic sentence: "He who believes in him, shall not have *his own* justice, which is of the law, although the law be good; but he will fulfil the law itself, not by *his own* justice, but by that which is given by God: for charity is the fulfilling of the law. And whence is this charity shed abroad in

the sinner, by approving his evil conduct, or suffering him to escape the just rigor of the law, is an abomination to the Lord; yet He himself glorifies his mercy in justifying the sinner, by exciting his faith, and moving his heart to compunction, and pardoning his sins, and making him just from unjust, and adorning his soul with the gifts of grace and sanctity."—*Bishop Kenrick on Justification*, p. 75.

* Andrews' Sermons, p. 726.

our hearts? not truly from us, but by the Holy Ghost who is given us."*

Now it is the positive justice of God in man through Jesus Christ only, and not his absolute justice without the creature, that the Church of Rome accounts to be our only justice that will endure the holy requirements of the law of faith, or stand the righteous acceptation of our unerring Judge. But, "by this means shrink they up," says Bishop Andrews, "the *name* Jehovah our Righteousness; and though they leave the full sound, yet take they half the sense from it." The sense, however, which Bishop Andrews refers to, being that of the absolute attributes of the Godhead, they do not, as he imagines, take it away by halves, but they denounce its imputation altogether, as the vain-glorying of a delusive and contradictory theory. But "this nipping at the name of Christ," with which he charges the Catholic Church, "is for no other reason," he says, "but that we may have some honor to ourselves out of *our own* righteousness."

Strange, indeed, would it be that the Church of Rome should attach any honor to *our own* righteousness, when she alone, in contradistinction from all Protestant societies whatever, declares, that the fruits of true faith are not to be confounded with *our own* works, but that the faith itself which justifies the creature is, in truth, nothing less than the gift and merit within him of the Lord himself. But is it not also strange that Protestantism should accuse her of upholding the doctrine of a self-righteousness, when the former, as we have before shown, from the writings of her divines, so expressly teaches that we are *sanctified by our own works*, in direct opposition to the teaching of the latter, which ascribes no honor to ourselves, but gives the undivided praise to the sanctity of our Head, who co-operates with his members in their preparation and meetness for the kingdom and inheritance of glory.

"Since the sanctity of every action," says Bossuet, "is the operation of God, who himself creates it in us; *the Church*, for this reason, in the Council of Trent, has

* Sermon xv, *de verbis Apostoli*, and quoted by Bishop Kenrick, in his work on Justification, p. 109.

adopted, as the *expression of her faith*, that saying of St. Austin, 'that in crowning the merit of his servants, *God merely crowns his own works.*'"

"Although we remark," say the fathers of the above-named assembly, "that the sacred Scriptures affix so much importance to good works, that Jesus Christ himself promises a reward even for a cup of cold water bestowed upon the poor; and that the apostle assures us, that momentary sufferings here shall produce an eternal weight of glory hereafter;—although all this be true, *still God forbid that the Christian should confide or glory in himself*, and not in the Lord; whose goodness towards men is so great, that he regards as their merits, the very gifts which Himself bestows upon them."

In another session,* this Council teaches, that, "although we can do nothing *of ourselves*, we can do every thing *through Him* who strengthens us: so that man has nothing wherein to glory; nothing wherein, as *in himself*, to place his confidence: but that *all* his confidence and glory repose in Jesus Christ, in whom we live; in whom we merit; and in whom we satisfy; performing worthy fruits of penance—fruits, which derive *all their efficacy from Him; by Him* are offered to the Eternal Father; and *through Him* accepted."

Can any thing, then, we ask, be a more triumphant refutation to the charge of Bishop Andrews against the Church of Rome, in that she dishonors the *name of Christ*, and that, for "no other reason," as he says, "but that we may have some honor to *ourselves* out of *our own righteousness?*"† What stronger denunciation can be given

* Sess. 14th, Ch. viii.

† To show how differently even some of the Continental Reformers testify in relation to this misrepresented doctrine of the Roman Church, as well as to present our readers with a striking contrast to the illiberal statements of Bishop Andrews on the same, we quote from a decision of a celebrated Lutheran University in the Dutchy of Brunswick, in 1707, the following paragraph:

"The same Christian assembly (the Council of Trent) teaches that the beginning of justification ought necessarily to proceed from God and his preventing grace; that is, from the vocation whereby God calls us, without *any* respect to *our own* merits. They teach, also, that neither faith nor good works do merit justification (itself); and that we are taught to believe sins never will be nor ever were forgiven, but through the mercy and grace of

of all reliance whatever upon our own works, or what clearer and more complete evidence that *all* our hope of salvation centres only in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord? "How singular then it is," we exclaim in the words of Bossuet, "and how great the misfortune, that the prejudices of the Protestant against his own parent church should be such, that neither the explanation of our faith; neither the decisions of our councils; nor the prayers of our liturgy and sacrifice, will induce him to believe that we place all our trust in Christ Jesus; that from Him alone, we derive life; and to Him alone, we look up for eternal happiness."*

We have already noticed, it will be remembered, the reasons which Bishops Beveridge and Hooker give, for God's imputing to us, as they allege, his *absolute* righteousness. These, we have seen, according to their theory, are founded upon his actually accounting the Victim for our offences, as a sinner. Let us now attend to the manner in which Bishop Andrews describes this same unhallowed imputation. "It was meet," he says, "for crimson sinners to have a crimson Saviour: a Saviour of such a color it behooved us to have. Coming then to save us, *off went his white*, on went our red: laid by *his own righteousness*, to be *clothed with our sin*."†

God and the will of Jesus Christ." "This is the doctrine," they also say, "of the Catholic Church, as has been observed by the virtuous Abbot, lately deceased at Doesburgh, in the preface of his 'abridgment of the rules of faith: 'the Church believes,' says he, 'and did ever teach, that no person, since the creation of the world, did ever attain salvation but by Jesus Christ, who is a mediator between God and man; according to what is written in the Acts of the Apostles, iv. 12; and as the Council of Trent has acknowledged it.'"

* Bossuet's Exposition of the Doctrines of the Catholic Church, Chap. viii.

† This imputation, by Andrews and other English Church divines, to Christ of our sins, this accounting of Him *as a sinner*, and in the same sense, as they say, that Adam's sin was accounted to us, is no less revolting than the system by which the Synod of Dort makes God the author of sin. The only difference between these two monstrous ways of imputation consists in this, viz. that while the one charges our sins upon the absolute divinity of God, the other imputes it to his humanity. In the one case, God is considered as if he were the actual *author of sin*, and, in the other, as if he were actually *a sinner* in his nature as man. Thus, in

What a monstrous exposition of our holy faith! This the ground of Christian salvation! What an unholy wresting of the Scriptures by man to his own destruction! What! because his judgment was taken from our blessed Redeemer in his humiliation, is this a reason for stripping Him—the Holy One of Israel—of *his own righteousness?* But we forbear, and pass on to the notice of other similar defenders of the Protestant faith. In the mean time, however, we refer our readers to several other passages on this subject, of a like nature, from the works of Bishop Andrews.

JOSEPH MEDE, B. D.

This divine is considered as a distinguished authority in behalf of the doctrines of the Anglican Church. He was, it is said, a very intimate friend of Bishop Andrews, from whose works we have just concluded our extracts, on the same points of the reformed faith; and is celebrated in the Protestant world for his work on the prophecies.

The following description of justifying faith by this learned writer, differs somewhat from those given by the authors whom we have before cited on this subject. These, it will be remembered, describe it, either as a *mere act* of man, or as a *mere office*, i. e., as they say, when it justifies. But Mede, although he does not use the same language, explains it on a similar principle, by maintaining the doctrine of its commencement in man as a mere

both respects, the sin is transferred from Adam and his posterity, and placed to the account of the immaculate Jehovah! "Two of the divines, (of the Synod of Dort,)" says Mr. Brandt, "elated with victory, insulted a poor fellow, who was a remonstrant, and said, 'What are you thinking of, with that grave and woful face?' 'I was thinking, gentlemen,' said he, 'of a controverted question—Who was the author of sin?—Adam shifted it off from himself, and laid it on his wife; she laid it on the serpent, who, being then young and bashful, had not a word to say for himself; but afterwards growing older and more audacious, he went to the Synod of Dort, and there had the assurance to charge it upon God.'"—(*Reformat. quoted by Jortin, Dissert., and found in the New Monthly Visitor, Oct.*, 1800.

act of the creature *in himself*, or a bare assent of *his own* mind to the truth of the Gospel. This he calls "*historical faith*," in which, he says, "*saving faith*" "*begins*."

Faith historical, therefore, according to him, being the beginning and the foundation, is not the same, he says, as justifying faith; on the contrary, they are widely distinct, the one from the other. For the latter, he maintains, is not "barely historical and in speculation," as is the former, "but *a faith in motion*, and able *to walk* and *to go* (!) unto Christ Jesus whom it believeth," and is, *therefore*, (!) "a *coming* belief, a coming faith." (!)

What a variety of faiths in the doctrine of this "profoundly learned divine," as he is termed in the English Church! In the first place, we have, it is said, faith in its beginning, which, he also says, is usually called *historical* faith. In this condition "it stands," "only gazing upon Christ," and is *then* an idle faith, only in *speculation*. (!) In the second place, we have saving faith, i. e. "*a faith in motion*," "*able to walk and to go*," and, moreover, "to *come*, (!) as a coming belief, a coming faith;" for this, he argues, "is manifested by those places of Scripture where coming and believing are interchangeably used as one and the same thing." "He that cometh unto me shall never hunger; he that believeth on me shall never thirst." "Here *coming*," says our learned divine, "is expounded by *believing*;" or, in other words, according to him, a coming faith is a *believing faith*, while historical faith is one which only stands idle, and gazing upon Christ. But since he defines the latter, as only a bare assent or persuasion that the gospel is true, must it not follow, that, in his doctrine, it *cannot* be "expounded by believing?"

The following passage, entire from the discourses of this divine on Matt. xi. 28, 29, will best illustrate his views of the reformed faith, as held in the English Church:

"This coming unto Christ, is the approaching unto him by faith; which is manifested by those places of Scripture where coming and believing are interchangeably used as one and the same thing. 'He that cometh to me shall never hunger; he that believeth on me shall never thirst.' Here *coming* is expounded by *believing*.

"Here, therefore, observe that a saving faith, a faith which

makes Christ our own, and hath promise of *ease* by him; in a word, that faith which gives us an interest in Christ Jesus, is more than a bare assent or persuasion that the Gospel is true. It is a *coming belief, a coming faith;* that is, an assent inclining the soul to Christ to be made partakers of the benefits through him, such an assent as not only believes the promises made in Christ, but goes unto him, relies upon him, clings unto him for them. Saving faith, *though it begins* with what is usually called *historical faith*, yet it stays not there. It stands not only gazing upon Christ, but is effectual and powerful upon the soul to make it apply and betake itself unto him.

"The motion or flight of the soul is *desire*. He that out of a true sense and feeling of his sin, (for no other can do it in good earnest,) desires Christ, he *goes* unto him. And Christ requires *no more* but that all those who are weary and heavy laden, should *thus* come unto him, and he will ease them. And this is the *first degree* (!) of a faith which is justifying, and gives interest in Christ Jesus; for this faith is not barely *historical* and in *speculation*, but a faith *in motion*, and able to walk and to go unto Christ Jesus, whom it believeth."—"Next follows the benefit, ease, and rest to thy soul. 'I will give you rest; that is, I will ease you of your sin, I will acquit you. And *this is what we call justification* of a sinner, which is (merely) an absolution or remission of sins, by the only merits and satisfaction of Christ, accepted for us and (outwardly) imputed to us."*

According, then, to this learned divine of the English Church, "the *first degree* of a faith which is justifying, and gives interest in Christ Jesus," is "a coming faith." Nevertheless, he says, the commencement of it originates in the mere natural powers of man, or in a *bare assent or act*† of

* Mede's Works, pp. 154-156.

† This is indeed the very basis of the system of the first Reformer himself, as will be seen in the following epitome of his theology. Speaking of Luther, the writer says in the following extract, "Il trouve dans l'Ecriture, que c'était par Jésus-Christ que tous les hommes avaient été rachetés, et de plus que c'était par la foi en Jesus-Christ que nous étions sauvés; il conclut de la que c'était par la foi (seule) que les mérites de Jesus-Christ nous étaient appliqués.

"Mais *quelle* est *cette* foi par la quelle les mérites de Jésus-Christ nous sont appliqués? Ce n'est pas seulement la persuasion ou la croyance des mérites de la religion, ou, comme il le dit luimême, *la foi infuse*, parce qu'*elle peut subsister avec le péché mortel.*(!)

"La foi qui nous justifie, est seulement UN ACTE par lequel nous nous croyons que Jésus-Christ est mort pour nous.

"Luther conçoit donc la satisfaction et les mérites de la mort de Jésus-Christ, comme un trésor immense de grace et de justice, préparé pour tous les hommes en général, et dont les fidèles *déterminent l'application* en formant seulement *un act* de foi, par lequel chaque fidéle *dit, je crois que Jésus Christ est mort pour moi.*(!)

his own mind to the *historical* truth of the Gospel. But when we arrive at the "first degree," in the above-named manner, it is entirely sufficient; and Christ requires *no more*, but that all those who are weary and heavy laden should *thus* come unto him. After the beginning, therefore, is ended in "the coming," or, in other words, the "first degree" "of saving faith," then, or rather, to use the language of our author, "now follows the benefit, ease, and rest to thy soul." "I will give you rest," &c. "And this is what *we* call *justification* of a sinner,"(!) imputed to us according to the forensic scheme, and in which all the writers we have before noticed agree, and who, with Bishop Andrews, most fervently exclaim, that nothing "can," to use his words, "be conceived more comfortable," and that the "wit of man can devise no more."

From what we have already said in relation to this doctrine of a faith which is held to have its commencement or origin in the natural powers of the creature, it may be superfluous in us to add, that the whole system

"Voilà le principe fondamental, ou plutot toute la doctrine de Luther, sur la justification.

"Comme la satisfaction *seule* de Jésus-Christ est le principe justifiant, et qu'il nous est *appliqué par l'acte* de foi par lequel le fidèle dit, Je croit que Jésus-Christ est mort pour moi, il est clair que les actions ou les œuvres de charite, de pénitence, etc., sont inutiles pour la justification des chrétiens. Luther croit pourtant que lorsque, par *cet acte* de foi, le fidèle *s'est appliqué réellement* les merits de Jesus-Christ, il faut de bonnes œuvres; mais il n'est pas moins évident que, dans son systême, ces bonnes œuvres sont *absolument inutiles* pour nous rendre agréeable à Dieu, et pour mériter à ses yeux, quoiqu'elles soient faites avec la grâce.

"Je dis que voilà le vrai systême de Luther, tel qu'il l'ènseigne expressément.—*Luth. Op., t.* 1. *Disput. de Fide, de Justific., de Operib.*

"De la Luther concluait que chaque fidèle devait croire fermement qu'il était sauvé, et que l'homme ne pouvait faire de mauvaises actions, lorsqu'il avait été justifié par la foi. Ces conséquences entrainèrent Luther dans mille contradictions que M. Bossuet a relevées admirablement."—*Hist. des Variat.*, L. 1.

"Voila le vrai systême, la vraie doctrine de Luther; dans ses disputes ou dans ses commentaires, il a adouci ses principes sur l'inutilité des bonnes œuvres; c'est une contradiction, et tout ce que M. Basnage a dit à ce sujet ne prouve rien de plus."—*Hist. des Eglises reformées. Memoires pour servir à l'histoire des égarmens de l'esprit humain," etc.—Tome* 2, *pp.* 289, 290.

is nothing more nor less than a cunningly contrived imitation of the heresy of Pelagius, which was so triumphantly refuted by St. Augustine, and of the error of Abelard, so clearly exposed by the irresistible arguments of St. Bernard.

It may be well to remark here, in relation to the writers we have cited, that they all strenuously maintain that, while we are justified through a faith originating or having its beginning in the creature's own acts, we are sanctified by an inherent righteousness, which they also interpret and classify as a principle of our *own* works.

Still, however, while they affirm that by the latter we are condemned, they, at the same time, with most singular inconsistency, contend that it is by them also we are sanctified. "True it is," says the author before us, "and nothing more true, that no works of ours in this life can abide the touchstone of God's law, and therefore not able to *justify* us in the presence of God, but to *condemn us*."* Still, faith alone, he maintains, having its commencement in our own act, and in a bare assent to the historical truth of the New Testament, is sufficient to justify us, while our own works also are able to sanctify us.(!) Such are the endless contradictions, and profane consequences, which necessarily arise from this hollow system of a forensic, carnal, and vain-glorious imputation.

DOWNAME,

BISHOP OF DERRY.

We now propose to notice the statements of Downame, Bishop of Derry, in the 17th century who, published a

* Have we not here, (though contrary, we will suppose, to his intention,) the very doctrine of Luther himself, and many of his professed followers, in respect to the denial of good works, who "would not allow them to be considered either as the conditions or the means of salvation, nor even as a preparation for receiving it;" (*Vide Mosheim, Ecclesi. Hist. Cent.* xxvii. *and* xxviii.) but distinctly taught that they were a hindrance to it, and in the words of the so-called Patriarch himself,—"*Sacrilegium est et impietas velle placere Deo per opera et non per solam fidem.*"—*Luther adversus regem.*

treatise* on the doctrine of *Protestant* imputation, with special reference to the works of Cardinal Bellarmine.

This "doctrine," (viz. of outward imputation,) says Bishop Downame, "is so inviolably and incorruptibly to be held, that if an Apostle, if an angel from heaven, shall teach any other gospel, that is, any other doctrine whereby to be justified and saved, than by the only merits of Christ apprehended by faith, (i. e. mere faith alone,) he ought to be held *accursed*. But by how much the more necessary and *comfortable* this doctrine is, by so much the more it is oppugned by Satan,—who hath opposed it by all means, as namely, by raising, not only other false teachers in the Apostles' times and since, but *even Antichrist and his adherents* (meaning thereby the Church of Rome) in these later times, who have not only perverted this doctrine, but also subverted it, and have, as it were, taken away the subject of the question; for by confounding the law and the gospel, the covenant of works and the covenant grace, the benefits of justification and sanctification, and of *two making but one*;† they have wholly abolished that great benefit of the *Messias* about justification, whereby *we* are freed from hell, and entitled to the kingdom of heaven, and consequently *they* are *fallen from grace*,‡ having disannulled the covenant of grace, and made the promise of none effect. For whosoever seeketh to be justified by *inherent* righteousness, he is under the curse, (!) he is a debtor to the whole law, and, therefore, *to him Christ has become of none effect.*"

* This work, which is entitled a Treatise on *Justification*, &c., is much esteemed among Protestant divines, as a production of great learning. It was published in 1633.

† The graces of these two divine operations are, by the Church of Christ, most clearly shown by her, "in demonstration and power," to be *substantially* one and the same. The severance of this heaven-born unity was one of the first capital errors of the Reformation, and is still blindly perpetuated in the theology of all the Protestant schools. Even the Oxford divines dwell with complacency upon this distinction, as the great landmark which divides their doctrine from that of the Church of Rome.

‡ As the High Church of England so formally disclaims all connection of faith and doctrine with any of the Churches in union with the *Continental* Reformers, we adduce the following candid acknowledgment of "all the professors of divinity in the University of Helmstadt," (dated April 28, 1707,) as a very *striking contrast* to the above most grossly ignorant and misrepresented statement of the Catholic faith. In reference to the Church of Rome, they say, that "The Creed, the Lord's Prayer, our Saviour's words concerning Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and the vocation of ministers," "are the articles they teach and press as the *necessary* points to become a Christian and have a share of salvation, as may be seen by the Roman catechisms of Canisius and Volusius, and the catechism lately printed at Hildesheim: wherefore the authors of the confession of *Augsburg* say, in the preface, that all Chris-

According to this divine, then, we are accounted to be just "by that righteousness of Christ which is *out of us*;"* "for it cannot," he says, "be imagined how this should be otherwise than by imputation."

Now, it will be admitted, that there are, without contradiction, two essentially distinct ways mentioned in the sacred writings, by which *moral properties*† may be imputed or accounted to man; viz. the one, by the law alone, and the other exclusively by grace without the law. The

tians, both Catholics and Protestants, fight together under Jesus Christ; and a little lower, they affirm that our Protestant religion is not contrary to the Christian religion, *nor even to the Roman Catholic;* and this will be acknowledged, say they, by consulting *the writings of the Fathers.* Which is so true, that we firmly and confidently believe persons of undoubted probity and piety are found in the Roman monasteries." "Neither can it be deemed that the Roman Church is not a true Church; wherein the ministry of God's word and the use of sacraments subsist." "Nay, Melancton himself has maintained that the Roman Church did not cease being the true Church, because the word of God was sufficiently taught in divers parts of the catechism, which contains the ten commandments, the Creed, and the Lord's prayer," &c., &c.

Luther, it appears, was not present at the assembly by whom this document was framed.

Dr. Maclaine says, that "his obstinate, stubborn, and violent temper, rendering him unfit for healing divisions, he was not employed in the conferences at *Augsburg*," where the above-named confession was drawn up in 1530.—(*Note to Mosheim's Ecclesiast. Hist. Cent.* xvi. *sect.* 1, *ch.* 3.) By the way, we may remark here, that *Chillingworth* also says of him, that he "was a man of a vehement spirit, and, very often, what he took in hand, he did not do it, but over do it."—(*Protest. not Heret., ch.* 6, *p.* 275, *fol. edit.*)—The character which Mr. Hallam gives him is as follows: "An unbounded dogmatism, resting on *the infallibity*, practically speaking, *of his own judgment*, pervades his writings; no indulgence is shown, no praise allowed, to the hesitating; whatever stands in the way of his decisions, *the fathers of the Church*, the schoolmen and philosophers, the canons and councils, are swept away in a current of impetuous declamation; and as every thing contained in Scripture, according to Luther, is easy to be understood in his sense, every deviation from his doctrine incurs the anathema of perdition." That the Church of Rome was shut out by her tenets from salvation, (and which is also taught in the above extract from Bishop Downame,) is more than insinuated in numerous passages of Luther's writings."—*Quoted by the Mirror, Vol.* xxix., *p.* 303, *from the Quarterly Review, and taken from Hallam's Introduction to the Literature of Europe, in the* 15*th &c. Cent., p.* 510, *et seq.*

* Page 21. † Viz. either good or evil.

question, then, at once arises, which of these two radically different modes constitutes the basis of that imputation which, in the teaching of the Apostles, is applied to the salvation of our race. For, between the two, it cannot be denied, that there is indeed no intermediate ground whatever; since if the one be of the law, it cannot be of grace; or if of grace, it cannot, by a like necessity, be of the law.

What then is the kind or system of imputation which, he informs us, "is so inviolably and incorruptibly to be held," that, if an apostle or an angel from heaven shall teach any other doctrine he ought to be held accursed?" His answer to this is as follows, "For even as we were made sinners by *Adam's* personal disobedience; so we are made righteous by the obedience of Christ."*

Now the Scriptures most plainly indicate that Adam and his natural posterity were made sinners by the power and operation of the violated law; and this, moreover, is emphatically styled by the Apostle Paul as "the power of sin."† But the whole argument of Bishop Downame proceeds on the fallacy that we are made just in the same manner that Adam was made a sinner.

The following passage from the above-named work of Bishop Downame, will suffice to give the reader a sufficient view of his reasoning on this subject:

"The formal cause of justification is the *imputation* of Christ's righteousness, because by imputing it the Lord doth justify; which I expressed in the definition. And this necessarily followeth upon that which hath been said of the matter. For it cannot be imagined how we should be justified by that righteousness of Christ which is out of us in him, otherwise than by imputation. For even as we were made sinners by *Adam's* personal disobedience; so we are made righteous by the obedience of Christ. But how could we either be made sinners by Adam's disobedience, or justified by the obedience of Christ, whether active or passive, unless they were communicated unto us? How could they possibly be communicated unto us, being both transient and having now no being? For true is that saying of a learned philosopher, *motus non est nisi dum fit; post-quam factus est, non est.* A motion (whether it be in action or passion) hath no being, but while it is in doing or suffering; after it is done, it hath no being. Adam's transgression was transient, and is past and gone so many thousand years past: the active obedience of Christ was transient; and so was his passive obedience, which had a being, *in rerum natura*, no

* Page 21. † Cor. xv. 56.

longer than they were in doing and in suffering. How then can either Adam's disobedience or Christ's obedience be communicated unto us? I answer, in respect of both, as Bellarmine answereth in respect of the former—*Communicatur eo modo quo communicari potest id quod transiit, nimirum per imputationem:* It is communicated after that manner, whereby that may be communicated which is transient and gone—to wit, by *imputation*." p. 21.

In this strain of mistaken reasoning he assumes it to be a fact that we are made sinners in no other way than by an actual *communication to us of Adam's personal disobedience*.(!) For how, he asks, "could we be made sinners by Adam's own transgression, *unless it were communicated?*" To this we answer, that it is the grossest absurdity to suppose that it could be communicated; for, in the language of Bishop Downame himself, "true is that saying of a learned philosopher, *motus non est nisi dum fit; post-quam factus est, non est.*"* The fact, therefore, is self-evident that his personal actions could not, "*in rerum natura*," be communicated. But that his evil disposition, on the other hand, with its attendant guilt, is communicated to all his natural posterity, is no less evident. And, moreover, it is sufficiently plain that his fallen and common nature is imparted to the rest of his species by the law of our natural descent and generation. But why so extravagant an idea should be entertained as the necessity of a communication to us of Adam's personal disobedience, in order to account for our being made sinners, it is difficult to conjecture; more especially as Scripture itself is so explicit in declaring to us how sin is actually imputed, and how our race has been involved in the guilt of the first transgression. As an argument, therefore, it can only be viewed as a fallacious attempt to institute a parallel between the acts of Adam and of Christ; between those of a mere creature and those of the Creator himself, for the vain and delusive object of supporting an anti-catholic justification of man by a pretended and absurd imputation according to the law.†

* Ibid, p. 21.

† The whole of these self-evident absurdities and contradictions are manifestly owing to the above anti-scriptural imputation of our being justified by a sentence of that law under which our race was condemned in Adam, and under which all his impenitent offspring

We have had no opportunity of examining the statement of Cardinal Bellarmine to which Bishop Downame refers, and which we have given in the above extract. We think the latter, however, has greatly misapprehended the cardinal's meaning in supposing him to assert that Adam's *personal* disobedience is communicated to us

are still in bondage. Bishop Hopkins of Raphoe, who is not unfrequently termed "a giant in theology" by his admirers, and who attributes our justification, in like manner with Bishop Downame, to the old covenant of works, expressly says, "it is the *righteousness* of the law which justifies us, though performed by another. And therefore, in this sense, whosoever are justified, it is according to the covenant of works."

The Catholic Church, on the other hand, teaches, that, in order to our being redeemed from this law, the Son of God assumed our nature, and by his sacrifice, according to the law, in the likeness of sinful flesh, condemned sin in the flesh, not that we might be justified by the law, which was weak through the flesh, but that the justification of the law might be accomplished in us, and we justified anew by his grace without the law. Her faith teaches us that, if there had been a law by which it was possible for us to have been renewed in justice, verily justice would have come by the law. But, inasmuch as *sin only* is imputed by the law of Moses, according to the ordinary course of nature, it became the second Adam to be the Author and Finisher of a new and better covenant, in order that we might be *truly made* as well as truly accounted just by the grace of his own body, which is his living and universal Church. By the mysterious and infused virtue, therefore, of the Man-God himself, applied to and *made inherent* in his members, are they most truly accounted as justified men, in respect to that bond of faith by which they are united to their Head, in the communion of one Spirit and one Lord and one Body. The whole of this blessing, therefore, originates only in the mercy and grace of God, in contradistinction from the law of works, by which all our race was condemned in their natural progenitor, and no flesh justified.

The lucid exposition which the Council of Trent gives of this doctrine deserves here our special attention. Let the following extract suffice for the present: "Cum enim ille ipse Christus Jesus tanquam caput in membra, et tanquam, vitis in palmites, in ipsos justificatos jugiter virtutem influat, quæ virtus bona eorum opera semper *antecedit*, et *comitatur*, et *subsequitur*, et sine qua nullo pacto Deo grata, et meritoria esse possent: *nihil ipsis justificatis amplius deesse* credendum est; quo minus plene illis quidem operibus, quæ in Deo sunt facta, divinæ legi pro hujus vitæ statu satisfecisse, et vitam æternam suo etiam tempore, si tamen in gratia decesserint, consequendam, vere promeruisse censeantur." "Ita neque *propria* nostra justitia, *tanquam ex nobis propria* statuitur; neque ignoratur aut repudiatur justitia Dei."—*Sess.* vi. *Caput* 16.

by *imputation*, or, indeed, by any other imaginary process, be it what it may.*

Should Bishop Downame, however, or any of the supporters of his theory, recant the contradictory notion of an imputation to us of Adam's personal acts, and be satisfied with the plain doctrine that his fallen and sinful nature is rightly accounted to us by the law of sin, still would it not only be absurd but actually profane to impute to us the obedience of Jesus Christ in this legal and judicial manner. For nothing, indeed, can be plainer

* While no Catholic can ever believe in Bishop Downame's theory on the communication of sin, neither will he pretend to deny that the sin of Adam is communicated to all his natural posterity ; at the same time, however, he can never be induced to believe, with him, that there is no difference in the condition of those who are living in mortal sin, or, in other words, under the bondage of the law, and those who are leading a virtuous life under the assistance of divine aid. The Protestant creed, we know, makes no distinction between sins, but counts them *all* alike, whether mortal or otherwise, and holds that they are all deserving of *eternal* punishment.

" If," says Bishop Beveridge, " there be not a bitter root in my heart, (as if sin were a substance !) whence proceeds so much bitter fruit in my life and conversation ?" " I do not only betray the inbred venom of my heart, by *poisoning* my *common* actions, but even my *most religious* performances also *with sin*." " Nay, I cannot so much as confess my sins, but my *very confessions are still aggravations of them ;* my repentance needs to be repented of, my tears want washing, and the very washing of my tears needs still to be washed over again with the blood of my Redeemer. Thus, not only the worst of my sins, but even the best of my duties, speak me a child of Adam. Insomuch that whensoever I reflect upon my past actions, methinks I cannot but look upon my whole life, from the time of my conception to this very moment, *to be but as one continued act* of sin."—(*Private Thoughts*, art. iv.)

On the above passage the celebrated author of " The Difficulties of Romanism," remarks, that " when a person is once brought into this state of mind, he will then, *and not till then*, begin to think seriously of another world."(!)

Thus, according to him, because the *deadly* guilt of sin leaves, as we admit, its wound behind, the former is never taken away in this life !

" *Hæret lateri lethalis arundo.*"

" Scripture," says Miss Agnew, " makes a distinction between the degrees of sin, and so does the Church ; and Protestants, in attempting to be wiser, lose themselves in endless contradiction and confusion. What means the distinction between the ' gnat and the camel,' between the ' mote and the beam,' but venial and mortal sin, or, in other words, faults and crimes?"—(*Geraldine*, p. 355.)

than that those to whom his obedience is truly imputed, are not under the law, but under grace.

Since Adam, however, and all his descendants after the flesh, are, by the law, accounted as sinners, it is not difficult to perceive how it is that the advocates of a forensic imputation are so united in declaring, with the divines we have before cited, that the immaculate Victim of Calvary was accounted by his Father *as a sinner!* more especially, as they all insist upon a justification according to a sentence of the law, and not according to a spiritual infusion of divine and inherent grace. For although they assert that, by the law, Christ was accounted as a sinner, still they say he was not so in truth; and, in like manner, they reason, from such premises, that although it is by the law we are accounted just, yet we are not actually so, as a matter of fact or undoubted reality. Thus it is that they utterly confound these plain and obvious doctrines of the Christian religion, viz. that we are truly accounted and made sinners only by the law, and that we are also truly accounted and made just, only by the grace and righteousness of God in us without the law.

But while we freely grant that the personal disobedience of Adam "was transient," as Bishop Downame says, and that it is, without contradiction, numbered with the years beyond the flood; we boldly ask, at the same time, how any one can dare to affirm that the obedience of the Man-God was a mere temporal act, or a transient action or passion? For while we unhesitatingly admit the maxim, that a mere "motion, whether it be action or passion, hath no being but while it is in doing or suffering," we deny, on the other hand, that it constitutes the slightest reason whatever for likening the transitory and personal acts of a mere creature to the eternal and most mysterious obedience of the only-begotten of the Father.

The actions, whether of Adam or of Christ, considered as works performed under and according to the law of our nature, and the visible constitution of things, are, it is fully evident, past and gone. Our Lord's obedience in the flesh, once finished for ever as a work of himself alone under the law, and in the humiliated image of the first Adam, unquestionably could have no being *under*

the economy of that law, after its final satisfaction by his death. But we ask, has it now no being *above* the law, and can we forget that it is the obedience of the "Second Adam the Lord from heaven?" An obedience which lives in eternity!—a power also of life and salvation in his faithful members, a gift which flows perpetually from his incarnate presence, and a grace of Divinity which he communicates through the agency of his Spirit and the sacraments of his eternal priesthood! Once was it terminated in death according to the flesh, and accomplished for ever by himself alone, as a work under the law, but now and henceforth we know it no more after this rule of natural and earthly being.

It was the solitary work of the Son of Man alone under the power of death, and, as such, was the inestimable price of our redemption from the bondage of the law. Considered also as a work of Almighty God, it is ever substantially the same in its existence, yesterday, to-day, and for ever. It is the offering of the Lamb that was slain from the foundation of the world, but was not actually manifested in our flesh under the law until the fulness of its appointed time. And although it cannot, of necessity, be repeated in the same mode of being, its substance and its spirit, which is coeval with the foundation of the world and the beginning of time, is nevertheless perpetuated in the unearthly communion of his mysterious body—the Church of the living God.

In this manner, it lives again by the spirit of his wondrous resurrection, and the mysterious power of his endless life, in a new and incomprehensible order of spiritual and supernatural being. By the holy mysteries, therefore, of this ineffable communion, is the grace and truth of his obedience shed abroad in the hearts and lives of his redeemed members. In this way, therefore, do we perceive how it is that the justice of Jesus Christ is both accounted and communicated to them, as their undivided property in him, and as his property in them.

The opponents, however, to this Catholic imputation of Christ's merits and obedience, considered as a spiritual gift and infusion, object to it on the ground of its *mysterious* character and import. But the legal imputation of the same, according to Protestant faith, so far from giving

us, as it professes, the only consistent theory of our justification, presents us, as we have seen, with nothing less than downright absurdity and contradiction. We do not then deny that,

> The *mysterious* "sense is hard to flesh and blood,"
> "But nonsense never could be understood."—DRYDEN.

Again, if we are accounted just in the manner that Bishop Downame maintains, i. e. in the way by which Adam is accounted as a sinner, it would follow that our justification, according to him, is by the very law the transgression of which occasioned the disasters of our fall. But as this is the law by which we are not only accounted and made sinners, but condemned as such, nothing can be plainer than that our justification, no less than our sanctification, can never be accomplished except by an indwelling power only of divine grace shed abroad and infused in the hearts of accepted children.*

Thus the Protestant system of imputation accounts all things indiscriminately by the law. In this manner, evil and good are so confounded, that the latter is even attempted to be explained on the very same principle with the former, and the one not unfrequently put for the other. Thus we find its advocates to hold that, inasmuch as Adam was accounted to be a sinner according to the law, so also was Christ accounted to be the same; and so, in in like manner, they pretend, that we also are accounted to be just, and that this is the true and evangelical meaning of our justification in the sight of Almighty God. But should we press them to declare, whether the species of imputation which their system advocates be actually true

* On the utter impotency of the law of God in nature to justify men, the Council of Trent say as follows: "Primum declarat sancta Synodus ad justificationis doctrinam probe et sincere intelligendam, oportere, ut unusquisque agnoscat, et fateatur, quod cum omnes homines in prævaricatione Adæ innocentiam perdidissent, facti immundi, et ut Apostolus inquit, natura filii iræ, quemadmodum in decreto de peccato originali exposuit, usque adeo servi erant peccati, et sub potestate Diaboli ac mortis, ut non modo gentes per vim naturæ, sed ne Judæi quidem *per ipsam etiam literam legis Moysis*, inde liberari, aut surgere possent; tametsi in eis liberum arbitrium minime extinctum esset, viribus licet attenuatum, et inclinatum."—*Sess.* vi. *Cap.* i.

or not true, what is the reply, in such a case, we should expect to receive ? It is this : that the imputation must, at the same time, be both true and false ! For while Christ, they say, was actually accounted by God as a sinner, he was not so in fact ; and, in like manner, while he accounts us as just, it is folly in us to believe that it is really so, in plain and sober truth !

In the same way, also, whether it be said, " Unless a man be born of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God ;"* or, " Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you ;"† or, it is " God who justifieth ;"‡ in the same way, we repeat, might men, on such a principle of imputation as the above, affirm, with equal consistency, that all these things are not so meant as God has actually said, but that they are only and simply so accounted !

Again, as Bishop Downame so strongly insists upon an imputation to us of Christ's obedience in the same manner as the guilt of Adam's transgression is imputed, we would ask what other system can tend more than this, to use his own language, to an utter " confounding of the law and the gospel, the covenant of works and the covenant of grace ?" And yet this is the very beam which he professes to discover in the eyes of his Catholic neighbors, and with which he charges their Church as being the followers of " Antichrist and his adherents in these latter times," of " having fallen from grace, having disannulled the covenant" of the same, " and made the promise of none effect."

" The first capital error," he says, " of the Papists," as he terms the Catholic Church, " is that they utterly abolish the *principal* benefit which we have by Christ in this life, by which we are freed from hell, and entitled to the kingdom of heaven." " And this," he says, " they do in two respects ;" " for, first, they hold that" we are made just by an inward grace, and, " secondly, that they make the remission of sin" to consist in its " utter deletion or expulsion."§

* John iii. 5. † John vi. 54. ‡ Rom. viii. 33.

§ If this were *only covered* as with a garment, it would not then,

Now, "the principal benefit," to which Bishop Downame refers, is what he and the other writers whom we have before cited term the legal or forensic imputation of the absolute and proper justice of the Godhead, but which imputation the Catholic Church rejects as a vain imagination of man against the truth as it is in Jesus Christ. This attribute of the Divinity by which he is just only in himself alone, is, when, according to their theory, it becomes *ours*, called in the language of its expositors by a variety of names. Bishop Andrews says, it is "*our* righteousness in *the abstract*," (!) and not in the concrete."(!) Bishop Hopkins describes it as "our judicial righteousness," in contradistinction from a "physical denomination," or righteousness "in a physical sense;" and others again by terms equally explanatory of the meaning which they attach to this imputative system.

Since, now, it is absolutely impossible that this incommunicable justice of Almighty God, whereby he is just in himself alone, and which is proper to him only, can, in any sense, be accounted to the creature, it is evident that the imputative scheme of Bishop Downame, and the other English divines, professing as it does to convey to us the merits of Jesus Christ in this imaginary manner, to the exclusion of every other sort of imputation, does, without contradiction, "utterly abolish," to use the language of the bishop, "the principal benefit which we have by Christ in this life," and we add, moreover, in that which is to come. With regard to the allegation of Bishop Downame, that the Catholic Church makes the remission of sin "*not* to be the pardoning and forgiving of sin," we can only affirm it to be most untrue;* for while the Church maintains that the sins of the justified

it is certain, be either pardoned, or remitted, or effaced; but only concealed, as it were, by a cloak, instead of being really blotted out and cancelled by the blood of Jesus Christ.

* How comes it, we ask, that a man so learned as Bishop Downame is on other subjects, should be so ignorant of what the Catholic Church actually teaches in her authorized documents, as to affirm that her faith does not make the remission of sins to consist in their forgiveness? Is it not reasonable to suppose, that one who undertakes to be the antagonist of the Catholic doctrine, and especially against so distinguished a controvertist as Cardinal Bellar-

are no longer imputed to them according to the law of death, by reason of their deliverance from its sentence, she, at the same time, most formally declares the entire pardon and absolution of their guilt. God and his Church

mine, should be at least acquainted with her established formularies.

The fact is, that the Catholic Church invariably speaks of the remission and pardon of sin as convertible terms, and also most distinctly teaches that, when man has sinned, the remission or pardon is not attainable by him otherwise than in and by the merits of the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ, and that it is only through the same merits that the pardoned man can obtain either an increase of justice in this life, or eternal happiness in the next.

Bossuet, in his exposition of the doctrine of the Church, speaks as follows: "Nous croyons, premierment, que nos péchés nous sont remit gratuitement par la miséricorde divine: ce sont les propres termes du concile de Trent, qui ajoute que nous sommes dits justifiés gratuitement, parce qu' aucune de ces choses qui précèdent la justification ne peuvent mériter cette grace."—(*Conc. Trid., Sess.* 6, *C.* 9, *C.* 2.)

"Comment l'Ecriture nous explique la rémission des péchés, tantôt en disant que Dieu les couvre, et tantôt en disant qu'il les ôte et qu'il les efface par la grâce du Saint-Esprit qui nous fait nouvelles créatures; nous croyons *qu'il faut joindre ensemble ces expressions*, pour former l'idée parfaite de la justification du pécheur; c'est pourquoi nous croyons que nos péchés, non-seulement sont couverts, mais qu'ils sont entièrement effacés par le sang de Jésus-Christ, et par la grace qui nous régénère; ce qui, loin d'obsurcir ou de diminuer l'idée qu'on doit avoir du mérite de ce sang, l'augmente au contraire, et la relève. Ainsi la justice de Jésus-Christ est *non seulement imputée*, mais actuellement communiquée a ses fidèles, (i. e. dans leur pardon) par l'opération du Saint-Esprit; en sorte que non seulement ils sont épurés, mais faits justes, par sa grace.

"Si la justice qui est en nous, n'était justice qu'aux yeux des hommes, (viz. according to that faith of "the Apostle of England," which he distinguishes as "James' only," seeing it justifies us *only before the world*, in contradistinction from "Paul's only" that justifies us *only before God*.—See page 2,) ce ne serait pas l'ouvrage du Saint-Esprit; elle est donc justice même devant Dieu, puisque c'est Dieu qui la fait en nous, en répandant la charité dans nos cœurs."

See, also, the Catechism of the Council of Trent, on the words "forgive us our debts;" where this subject is treated at length, and where it is said that, in presenting this petition, we fly to him as to a *Father, not a Judge*, imploring him to deal with us, not in his justice, but in his mercy. A variety of scriptural authorities are also there cited to this effect, and examples referred to of individuals whose repentance God rewarded *with the pardon* of the most grievous crimes.

account to its justified members the grace which has been bestowed upon us as *new creatures* through the merits of Christ, as their justice in him, and as his justice in them, through the unity of his spirit and faith. By the infusion of these gifts, they are, *at one and the same time*, both cleared from their sins and made partakers of his mediatorial righteousness. And although, according to the law, all men are sinners *in themselves* before God, they are, nevertheless, when justified by his gift, in that sense, most truly accounted as his sons, not under the law, but under grace, according to the words of the Apostle, that as "sin was not imputed when the law was not,"* so now, "after that faith is come we are no longer under the law," that we may be "the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus."†

The above, then, is the declared doctrine of the Catholic Church, and hence it is evident that when she pardons she also justifies, and that she does not, as Bishop Downame asserts, exclude in any way the forgiveness of sin from its remission. Who then can affirm that there is sin in the grace and justice of God thus bestowed and thus accounted? Let it, however, be always remembered, that her imputation of pardon and grace is never according to an imaginary sentence of the law, but only according to "the work of the Lord," and the Spirit of his resurrection; that *her* wisdom should not stand on the mere judgment of fallible man, but on the power and authority of the living God. Her ministration, moreover, is not of the law, but of the New Testament; not indeed of the letter, but of the spirit, for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.‡

But Bishop Downame insists that "the Papists" "deride imputed justice, calling it *putatitia*, as if it were an imaginary righteousness only," in like manner as Bishop Hopkins declares it to be "very wonderful that the Papists should so obstinately resolve not to *understand* (!) this doctrine of imputed righteousness, but still cavil against it as a contradiction."§ These divines, however, and indeed all the opponents of the Catholic faith, most

* Rom. v. 13. † Gal. iii. 25, 26. ‡ 2 Cor. iii. 6.
§ Works of Bishop Hopkins of Raphoe, Vol. 2, pp. 323, 324.

grievously err in supposing either that the Church of Rome *derides* or that she does not *understand* the doctrine of imputed justice. For, as we have before affirmed, it is neither imputation nor imputed justice which she condemns. Nor are Catholic writers, in defending their faith on this point, by any means so ignorant *as not to understand the distinction* between the principle of *their* imputation and that of Protestantism. That which the Catholic Church condemns is, we repeat, the vain and visionary imputation to us of a justice which belongs to the Creator alone for *our* justification; and the equally vain and visionary imputation of a personal and proper righteousness of *our own*, for our sanctification. It is, in short, the imputation to us of any thing but the merits of Jesus Christ, by which he justifies and sanctifies and purifies his members on the earth, in order to fit them for their inheritance above. Therefore it is that the Catholic Church holds it as profane to account to us the justice of Jesus Christ, on the principle of Bishop Downame's system, whether it be in the way by which he imputes to us the sin of Adam, or in that still more revolting interpretation, which accounts the Victim of Calvary "*as a sinner*," in order that we might be entitled to the absolute and proper righteousness of the Godhead!

Agreeably also to the principles of his imputative doctrine, Bishop Downame zealously maintains that men are sanctified by *their own works*, and "only by a righteousness which is unperfect and but begun, which in justice can neither satisfy for their sins nor merit eternal life."* Now the Catholic Church, on the other hand, utterly rejects all such righteousness as "filthy rags," as being no other than the self or pharisaical righteousness of the Jewish doctors, and altogether repugnant to the one Christian justice of our blessed Redeemer, whose unity of faith and spirit both justifies while it sanctifies, and, moreover, makes men holy, only when it makes them just.

The ignorance which Bishop Downame displays in regard to the Catholic faith, is no less remarkable than that of the other writers whom we have noticed. He

* Treatise on Justification, p. 290.

gravely informs his readers that "the papists do not only hold that justifying faith may be without knowledge, but that also it may be better defined by ignorance than by knowledge." And "this faith," he says, "which is *without knowledge*, they call implicit faith."(!)*

Now from what we have already said it is needless, we think, to state that the assertion is altogether gratuitous and unfounded. But let us hear Bishop Downame's own definitions of this theological virtue or sacred principle of grace. Like all the advocates, therefore, of a legal and judicial imputation, he calls justifying faith a *mere act, or habit, or quality*, inherent in us, and a *mere* instrument or hand only "to apprehend or receive Christ."† Now this mere act, as he calls it, he maintains to be essentially distinct from the justice of Christ, which, in this system, is only the external object of the former. It has, he says, of itself, neither worthiness nor merit, nor indeed any purifying or sanctifying efficacy whatever, but being, in itself, only a bare and worthless act of the creature alone, is, nevertheless, *in that sense, the only* "*condition* of the covenant of grace to which the promises of remission of sins and of salvation are made, without which the promises of the gospel do not appertain unto us, and without which our blessed Saviour doth not save us."‡ But "the Papists," he says, although they "seem to plead for faith," have entirely abolished its benefit; and "though they retain the name" of justifying faith, "yet in their doctrine there is," he maintains, "no such thing." Now such charges are by no means surprising, when he imagines the Catholic Church to hold that the principle in question "may better be defined by ignorance than by knowledge,"§ and

* p. 315. † p. 369. ‡ p. 369.

§ Having now laid before our readers the definitions which Bishop Downame has given of that sort of faith which he advocates, in opposition to the one which, he says, is maintained by "the Papists," and held by them that it may be not only without knowledge, "but that it may also be *better defined* by ignorance than by knowledge," we here transcribe the words of their Church on this subject from the following exposition of the Council of Trent:— "When the apostle says that man is justified by faith, and gratuitously, his words are to be understood *in that sense* which the perpetual consent of the Catholic Church has held and expressed; to

when he wonders at their inability to understand it, according to the forensic rule of Protestantism, and the system of its "double Christian righteousness." For the Catholic faith, we have seen, declares it to be evidently repugnant to reason as well as Scripture, to suppose it possible that a fallen creature can either be accounted just by the power of Sinai's law, or be made holy by a righteousness of his own nature. On the other hand, let it ever be remembered that, while Protestantism values her faith according to the principles of man's *own* judgment, and according to a personal sanctity of *his own*, the Church of Rome speaks only in the Name and Spirit of her invisible Head, according to that faith which was once delivered to her from above, in the unity of a righteousness which is *not our own*, but the gracious power and merit only of Jesus Christ in the hearts of his obedient followers. Here, and here only, do men find a strength which is *not their own*, and by which, only, they are enabled to co-operate in the race, at whose goal above they "shall receive a never-fading crown of glory."*

BISHOP HALL.†

Bishop Hall, in his exposition of the Protestant principle of inherent justice, also informs us that it is considered by his Church as a righteousness of *our own*, but that it is nevertheless "wrought in us by the Holy Spirit."‡(!) What a contradiction! The work of the Holy Spirit, a self-righteousness of man! And although it is not, he says, "*so* perfect that it can bear us out be-

wit, that therefore is man made just by faith, because faith is the beginning of man's salvation, the foundation and root of all justice, without which it is impossible to please God."—(*Sess.* vi. c. 8) This faith, therefore, we perceive to be essentially one, being *both* justifying and sanctifying, and conformable also to its object, viz. the truths taught by Jesus Christ. To those truths Catholic faith gives an entire and *implicit* assent.

* 1 Peter, iv. 5.

† Bishop Hall is the author of the celebrated work, entitled "No peace with Rome."

‡ See Hall's works, 8vo., from p. 238 to 244.

fore the tribunal of God," yet is it notwithstanding capable, in his view, of actually making us holy in ourselves! But the way by which, on the other hand, we are, according to him, accounted just before God, is a judicial imputation to us of the righteousness of God, which being, he says, in this manner "made ours by faith, is that whereby we are justified in the sight of God; and this doctrine," he very correctly adds, "is *that* which is blasted with a Tridentine curse."*

* The following is the exposition of the "Tridentine" Council, which so clearly condemns the doctrine contended for by Bishop Hall:

"Though no man can be just, but he to whom the merits of the passion of Christ are communicated; yet this is done in the justification of the sinner, when, by the merit of that passion, the charity of God is infused into the hearts of them that are justified, and dwells therein; whence, together with the remission of sins, man receives through Jesus Christ the virtues of faith, hope, and charity."—(Sess. vi. c. 7. p. 30.) "Wherefore, to them who do well unto the end, eternal life ought to be proposed; both as a grace which is mercifully promised to them through Jesus Christ, and as a recompense of their good works and merits, in virtue of this promise. And as Jesus Christ perpetually sheds his influence on them that are justified; which influence precedes, and accompanies, and follows all their good works, and without which no works can be pleasing to God, we must believe that nothing is now wanting to render them deserving of eternal life, in reward of their good deeds, provided they depart this life in the grace of God. Although in the Holy Scriptures good works are so much valued, that Jesus Christ himself promises, that a cup of cold water shall not lose its reward; and that the Apostle testifies, that a momentary pain endured in this world shall produce an eternal weight of glory; nevertheless, God forbid that a Christian should trust or glory *in himself*, and not in the Lord, whose bounty is so great to all men, that he will have those gifts, which he bestows upon them, to be their merits."—(Ib. c. xvi. p. 39.) "This council," (in the language of a work entitled "The Faith of Catholics," &c., compiled by Rev. J. Berington and Rev. J. Kirk,) "which opened in 1585, was convened against the errors of Luther, and other innovators, and for the reform of abuses; and as it is the last general one that has been held, and its decisions on doctrinal points are universally admitted by the Latin Church, these decisions may be considered as forming a complete statement of the doctrines which the prelates, assembled at Trent, had received from their predecessors. On the subject of justification they say: 'This holy Synod means to expound to the faithful that true and sound doctrine, which Christ, the author of our faith, taught, which the Apostles delivered, and which the Catholic Church, guided by the Holy Spirit, has *ever retained*.'"—(Sess. vi.)

"Lo," he continues, "*so were we made his righteousness as he was made our sin.*"(!) That is, according to Bishop Hall, he was personally accounted by the law *as a sinner*, and in the same personal manner are we also accounted his righteousness. The same legal "imputation," he says, "doeth both." For "St. Paul," he adds, "was a great saint; he had *a righteousness of his own*, not as Pharisee only, but *as an Apostle.*"(!) Thus a legal righteousness which is ascribed to him as a Pharisee, according to the Mosaic law, is united with the evangelical righteousness of an Apostle of the Church of Christ! And although he holds that by neither of these was the Apostle justified, yet he maintains that he was by these actually made holy or sanctified! In this, he says, consists the glorious distinction between that of being *accounted just*, and that of being made holy; God thus imputing, *without giving*, to men his own righteousness, for their justification, and then sanctifying them by *a legal and pharisaical righteousness of their own!* And this, he argues, was the distinctive righteousness of St. Paul, both as a Pharisee and an Apostle.*

NICHOLSON,

BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER.

This prelate was made Bishop of Gloucester in 1660, and is considered as one of the most learned divines in the English Church. "His works," says Nelson in his Life of Bishop Bull, "show him to have been a person of great learning, piety, and prudence, particularly his apology for the discipline of the Antient Church and his Exposition of the Apostles' Creed. Not only for his knowledge of the Fathers and Schoolmen, but also for the great share of critical learning whereof he was master." He is also said to have been much consulted by Bishop Bull, while engaged in his celebrated Harmonia.

* Or rather, in the words of Bishop Hall, "a righteousness of *his own*; not as a Pharisee only, but as an Apostle."(!) A sectarian righteousness, united to another one of the Universal Church!

This distinguished divine of the English Church maintains, with Hooker, Andrews, and all the other writers we have cited, the same doctrine of "a double Christian righteousness," or, in the words of Hooker, that "there be two kinds of Christian righteousness," and with Andrews, that "both these are ours."

Although his phraseology may somewhat vary from that of the above-named divines, his doctrine, in the article of imputation, is, in all respects, the same. Like them, he divides Christian righteousness into two distinct kinds, calling the one inherent, as contradistinguished from the other, which, like all the rest, he styles imputed. The former, he says, is imperfect, but, notwithstanding, "consists in true sanctification and holiness, enabling a man to mortify his sins and lusts, and to bring forth the fruits of repentance, &c." Considering, therefore, that this "*true holiness*" is, according to him, "*imperfect*," "in what degree soever," "necessary it is," he adds, "that we hunger and thirst after *another*, which is the righteousness of Christ," viz. that which, in his opinion, "effectually *wrought the acceptation of our persons*."(!) In his judgment, also, faith itself is not the justice by which we are accepted; but instead of this he maintains the mere *external* obedience of Christ, (as it is called in Protestant nomenclature,) legally imputed to us in such a manner as to ensure the "*acceptation of our persons*."(!) Nothing, he maintains, "that *we* do," *even when it* "*is called believing in Christ*," will, or can be accepted for justice, but only "that which God doth" *alone without us*, and this, he says, "is called imputation." "And happy," he concludes, "is that soul to whom this (so called outward) righteousness is imputed," and that by faith alone!*

* Although St. Paul tells us expressly that our true faith is counted (and by consequence accepted) as righteousness, instead of that dead faith which is alone without Christ, and which St. James describes to be as vain and lifeless as a body without its soul.

Yet this is the faith—the barren and empty quality which is acknowledged by divines of the English Church to be founded on mere opinion, and taught by them to be the cardinal principle by which man is saved and justified. And this, moreover, is the very doctrine by which they accuse the Catholic Church of holding the damning error of salvation by *our own* works, but which, while the

But besides the "double or two-fold Christian righteousness," "we must," he says, "know that there is a two-fold purging," in order "that we may understand this point the better and be practitioners in it." The one is the consequence of imputation, and "is made by the blood of Christ." "The other, purging away sin, is by the Spirit of Christ." The first operates only by accounting us just, but the second by really making us holy.

This same distinction between the two Christian righteousnesses, as they are called, we have seen, is also maintained by Bishop Andrews, (who is called in the Oxford Tracts "one of our wisest doctors and rulers,") in phraseology almost identical. This, he also says, is so important to be kept in mind, that "we shall never," to use his words, "take the state of the question aright, unless we consider it in *this view.*"*

What confusion of the unity of our divine religion! What an unlawful severance of Christian faith, from Christian justice, and from Christian holiness! What an *unholy* separation of "the blood of Christ" from "the Spirit of Christ."(!)† But it is needless, from what we have before remarked on these distinctions, either to ex-

latter rejects them *in toto* for any divine grace whatever, as the selfish works of the law, the former upholds them as the very instrument of our sanctification and as the very basis of Christian charity and holiness. "Nevertheless," we say with the Council of Trent, "God forbid that a Christian should trust or glory in himself, and not in the Lord, whose bounty is so great to all men, that he will have those gifts, which he bestows upon them, to be their merits." (c. 16.) And this, we add, is that Catholic faith which is so much abused and misrepresented by Usher, Hooker, and Andrews, and all the other writers whom we have quoted; that faith, indeed, which is coeval with the birth of the Christian commonwealth and commensurate with the ends of the earth; or, in the words of St. Vincent of Lerins, "Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est."

* See his Exposition of the Apostles' Creed, pp. 40, 607.

† Who, that knows the history of our divine Lord, can be ignorant that his most sacred flesh, and blood, and soul, were violently and sacrilegiously rent asunder by the hands of cruel and wicked men? But how can Christians presume to teach their separation, in *his risen and glorious* state? This, indeed, can only be accounted for by that extraordinary confusion of mind which the novelty of the reformed creed has produced in relation to the cardinal points of distinction between our blessed Saviour's manner of being in his humanity *before and after* his resurrection, or be-

tend our comments, or increase our list of examples. Our main design, however, in citing opinions from Protestant divines on their vaunted doctrine of imputation, is to furnish the reader with some of *the highest and best authorities in the English Church*, on this grand and cardinal article of the Protestant Reformation.

With these views, therefore, we now close our citations from English divines, of other days, on this hinge or turning point of the Controversy. The selection which we have made will not be denied, we think, to be from among the highest and best authorities in their Church. We purpose, however, to notice also the peculiar reasonings of the Oxford Divines on this same vaunted doctrine of Protestant imputation.

We cannot, however, dismiss the subject without remarking, that we are aware it will be said by *some*, that the doctrine of a forensic or legal imputation is not the doctrine of the English Church, notwithstanding the undeniable fact of its zealous inculcation by many of her most distinguished divines. The determination of this question we submit to the judgment of our readers, by our appeal, as well to the authorities we have adduced on the subject, as to the general and acknowledged character and spirit of Protestant interpretation, respecting the tradition of our most holy faith.

We wish it, however, to be borne in mind, that our object was not to show that the doctrine in question was peculiar to the English Church; but, inasmuch as her Articles of Confession are so entirely wanting in instruction on many points of her belief, and, more especially,

tween his temporal humiliation under the law, and his unearthly and exalted condition in glory.

To those who have duly attended to this article of Christian belief it will not appear so strange, as it does to others, that the Church of Rome, while *in her Liturgy* she commemorates the separation of the species which was once made on the wood of the Cross according to the law, she also manifests, in the same rite, *the unity of their substance*, by her present discipline of giving it to the laity in one kind only, instead of two. Thus showing, before the consecration or change of the elements, the one sense in which the offering is representative, and, afterwards, the other, when the Victim himself is present in his human substance, whole, undivided, and entire, whether in the one kind or in the other.

on the manner in which the merits of the Atonement are applied to us, it was necessary, for this end, to have recourse to particular statements and expositions on the subject, by such of her divines as are *most generally* acknowledged to be of the highest authority, as rulers and doctors.

With regard to the other sects of Protestantism, the standards or confessions of the most prominent among them, are all very explicit on this principle of a legal imputation, in contradistinction from the characteristic or distinguishing principle of imputation, as set forth in the decisions and catechism of the Council of Trent. The former, in fact, constitutes the fundamental error of the reformed doctrine, or, in other words, the leading feature of the Protestant or anti-Catholic systems of faith and theological precept. We would, also, remind our readers, that the writers whom we have cited as supporting this doctrine, however they may differ from some of their brethren on other points, nevertheless preserve on this cardinal feature of the Protestant reform, amidst all its other variations of belief, a unanimity of sentiment and language too palpable to be mistaken or denied. In fact, the principle of *Catholic* imputation to us of the merits of Christ is so adverse to the Protestant theory, on this article, that there is not, *we are free to say*, an advocate of the latter, who can, consistently, support its necessary or logical consequences, without a concurrent and explicit abjuration of the former. And we confidently affirm, moreover, that there is not a single Protestant writer whatever to be met with, whether in or out of the establishment of the English Church, who does not in reality adhere, at least, to the main features of the imputative doctrine, as held and defined by the authorities we have adduced.

OXFORD DIVINES.

Even the Oxford Divines, who profess a decided difference of views on some points respecting the matter in question, as held by the writers we have referred to, nevertheless agree with them, on others, in such a manner

as virtually to deny the truth of *Catholic* imputation, and impugn its definitions by the Tridentine Council. Bishop Andrews, in particular, is called by them "one of our wisest doctors and rulers," and Dr. Pusey, by maintaining the same distinctions between justification and sanctification, in effect abjures the Catholic application of the atoning sacrifice, and, with the former, virtually adopts the self-same error of accounted righteousness. Between the two distinctive systems of the Protestant and the Catholic imputation of the justice of our divine Redeemer, there is, in fact, no possible medium whatever. If, on the one hand, we admit a single point belonging to the former, we of necessity admit the whole ; and if, on the other, we set aside a part of the latter, by a substitution of our own self-interpretations, in so doing, we equally frustrate or annul the whole. Precisely on the same principle of Catholic interpretation, are we taught, that "whosoever shall keep the whole law, but offend in one point, is become guilty of all."* For if we attempt to keep the royal and universal law of Christian faith, according to the Scripture and Apostolic tradition, and yet maintain a breach of catholic unity, by an imputation of justice, on the one hand, by the law of Moses, and of holiness, on the other, by the law of Christ, or support an imputation to man of a justice without, by the former, and of a holiness within, by the latter—or in whatsoever manner we may otherwise ingeniously attempt to make a severance in the only one authorized rule of spiritual and Christian imputation ; in one and all of these various and sectarian methods of interpretation and illogical reasoning, we evidently abuse the doctrine of our salvation by grace, and, by destroying the unity of Christian faith, we necessarily perpetuate those evils of schism which have so long, and so unhappily, marked the profession of the Christian name. However strongly, therefore, we may profess to repudiate some of the absurdities of Protestant imputation, as represented by the authorities we have adduced, and retain others which may not, at first, appear so obviously glaring, it is evident, that by so doing, we both sanction the principle itself, as well as all the fatal consequences necessarily connected with its adoption.

* James ii. 10.

DR. PUSEY.

In illustration of the above views, we have only to advert to the peculiar sentiments inculcated on this topic in the writings of the Oxford divines. Dr. Pusey, for instance, in his letter to the Bishop of Oxford,* says, that "The Anglican doctrine, (on this point,) or that which we *conceive* to have been the teaching of the majority of our Church," "differs from the Roman, in that it excludes sanctification from having *any place* in our justification."

Dr. Pusey, therefore, in this essential point of Protestant imputation, agrees with all the divines we have quoted. Every one of these, it will be remembered, refers our sanctification to the influence or operation of *our own* works, and makes it consist in a personal holiness of our own, while they maintain that we are merely accounted, but not actually made just, by a supposed sentence of the law. Dr. Pusey, however, admits that we are made just by an inward righteousness, and not simply accounted so by such an imaginary act of the law.

It is, notwithstanding, manifest that his denial and exclusion of sanctification from this work, is a virtual, if not a direct contradiction to the former tenet, and entirely invalidates its acknowledgment. How man can be justified, without being at the same time sanctified, is an enigma which it is not possible to explain, except by the fiction of a legal imputation. And how Dr. Pusey can admit that the "principle" and "gift" of justice is infused in us for our justification, and, at the same time, deny it to be a principle and gift of holiness also, is utterly inconceivable; or with what consistency he can deny the identity of the principle, is equally unaccountable. The diversity of the two operations of justifying and sanctifying is sufficiently manifest in their distinct modes of action or influence, but constitutes no reason for denying the identity of the substance upon which

* The work alluded to is entitled "A Letter to the Rt. Rev. Father in God, Richard Ld. Bishop of Oxford, on the tendency to Romanism imputed to doctrines held of old, as now, in the English Church."

they are both founded, and in which they both consist, and by which, also, they both act, and derive their power.

It is also objected to, by some of the Oxford divines, that the Church of Rome makes the infused righteousness, by which we are justified, to consist simply in a mere quality of the mind. This, however, is altogether a mistake. On the contrary, she accounts it *both* as a substance and a quality inherent in the renewed man, through the gift of the Spirit, and the merits of Jesus Christ. We are, therefore, constrained to say, that on this point of the Oxford theology, there is a confusion and an ambiguity of statement which renders it difficult for us to decipher its meaning. For, notwithstanding the alleged objection, it is said in Tract No. 71, that, with the Church of Rome, "It is *de fide* that man is justified by inherent righteousness;" but that "it is *not de fide* that justifying righteousness is a habit or quality." The fact is that it is *de fide*, not to account it as a *mere* quality, but as a supernatural gift or principle, in necessary connection with *spiritual* qualities or properties which cannot be separated from their divine substance. One thing, however, is certain, in respect to Oxford divinity, that it expressly "excludes sanctification from having any place in our justification;" and this, their fundamental position, forms, as we have already shown, the very essence of the judicial system of imputation, and the identical source of the various contradictions we have had occasion to notice.

MR. NEWMAN.

Mr. Newman maintains the same distinction with Dr. Pusey. In his Lectures on Justification, he says, "This is really and truly our justification, *not faith*, *not holiness*, not a mere imputation, but the very presence of Christ;"* not renovation, not obedience, not any thing cognizable by man, but a certain *divine gift* in which all these qualities are included."†

* p. 167. † Ibid p. 159.

For our part, we confess that we do not understand the reasons which are here given, for maintaining the distinction which is held by the Oxford Divinity on this point. Of this, however, we are certain, that if we make the justifying principle to be one thing, and the principle of renewal to be another, it is nothing more nor less than the very element of that forensic imputation which maintains the necessity of "two Christian righteousnesses," and of a "two-fold" or "double" faith, and the very source of all the countless ills which that melancholy and disastrous scheme is heir to. We see, therefore, no possible escape from the dangers of the forensic or Protestant doctrine of imputation, unless in the *entire* adoption of *the one only spiritual and catholic* principle of imputation as held and cherished in the bosom of the Church of Rome.*

Mr. Newman, in his Lectures on Justification, reasons in the following manner: "If we say that justification consists in a supernatural quality imparted to the soul by God's grace, as the Romanists say, then, in like manner, the question arises, is this quality *all that is in us of heaven?* Does not the grace itself, as an immediate divine power or presence, dwell in the hearts which are gifted with this renovating principle? It may or it may not; but if it does, then surely its *possession* is really our justification, and not renewal or the principle of renewal."†

We will now endeavor to give our answer to the above, by adhering, as closely as we can, to the language of Mr. Newman. If Mr. Newman means, therefore, that the Church of Rome holds justification to consist only in a mere quality imparted to the soul, he unquestionably mistakes her meaning; and were this indeed

* But the Oxford Divines seem to think that they get over the difficulties of Protestant imputation, by arguing that the work is not effected *wholly*, but *partly* by imputation, and *partly* by infusion. In this *partial* and *anti-Catholic* system, they follow Hooker, after he had abandoned the scheme of his earlier days, and acquired, in more mature age, according to Mr. Keeble, that "*independence* of mind," which, he adds, is so strikingly displayed in his "Ecclesiastical Polity"—*Hooker's Eccl. Polit., edited by Keeble.*
This point we purpose to examine in the sequel of our remarks.

† pp. 150, 151.

her doctrine, then certainly might the question be lawfully raised, is this quality *all* that is in us of heaven? But she holds it to be a supernatural principle and gift, *as well as* a supernatural quality—that it is not a quality without a substance, nor a substance without a quality. She knows, indeed, of no property, either within us or without us, that is "*our* righteousness in the abstract, and not in the concrete," as Bishop Andrews defines it. She holds, also, that the heavenly substance in question is "the grace itself, as an immediate divine power or presence dwelling in the hearts which are gifted with this renovating principle." "If," therefore, "it does, (so dwell,) then surely," as Mr. Newman says, "its possession (i. e. of the gift or renovating principle) is really our justification," and, therefore, being *not* a "mere quality of the mind," is, actually and in truth, our renewal or the principle of our renewal.*

The distinction, therefore, maintained by the Oxford divinity, between our justification and sanctification, is visionary in the extreme, and directly opposed to the integrity of catholic principle, although it professes its support only by a gratuitous charge against the Council of Trent, in holding a tenet which the Church, in that very synod, most distinctly repudiates, as the peculiar and characteristic feature of the old but revived heresy of a legal and *judaizing* imputation. "The Apostle," Mr. Newman remarks again, "goes on to say, that the only true justification is the being *made* holy or renewed;" and does not this, he asks, "*imply*, from the very nature of the case, that renewal was *not* just the same as justification?" We answer, on the contrary, that the statement of the Apostle is as conclusive in regard to the evidence of an identity, as the power of language itself

* "Yet the same learned writer," says Bishop Kenrick, "wishing to appear to differ from us, whilst in reality he agrees with us, makes distinctions which are *scarcely intelligible*." "To what purpose, then," he asks in another place, "is a groundless controversy excited, and the unity of Christian faith destroyed by the *invention* of distinctions not necessary to preserve the integrity of divine truth," but which, we add, is directly calculated to obscure the light of divine revelation, and perpetuate the lamentable schism which still rends the Christian world?—*Bishop Kenrick on Justification*, chap. 8.

can furnish. We confess, therefore, we do not see how Mr. Newman intends this Apostolic statement as a reason for *his own* denial of the identity. And we therefore again say, in the words of Mr. Newman, that "Scripture expressly declares that (Christian) righteousness is a divine, inward gift, while, at the same time, it teaches that it is not any *mere* quality of mind;" but we say, moreover, that this divine gift also necessarily includes faith, holiness, renewal, and the very presence of Christ himself in the hearts of his justified members. If Mr. Newman, however, intends to hold the anti-Catholic doctrine, that Christian faith and holiness is to be accounted only as a "*mere* quality of mind," as it would appear, from his language, when he says, that Scripture teaches us that righteousness "is not any mere quality of mind, whether (or such as) *faith or holiness;*" then must he of necessity give up his professed doctrine of a justification by an inward gift, and hence fall back upon the reformed principle of a legal imputation. And if it be seriously held that Christian faith or holiness is a mere quality of mind, and not the divine gift or presence of Christ within, then is it manifest that such a doctrine is a virtual and unqualified denial of our justification, by catholic faith in the merits of our crucified Redeemer. When Mr. Newman, therefore, remarks, that "the Apostle goes on to say that the only true justification is being *made* holy or renewed;" and, when, in reference to this, he asks, "does not this imply, from the very nature of the case, that renewal was *not* just the same as justification;" we answer him, in his own words, that this "only *true* justification" "*is really and truly* our justification," that "it is *not* any mere quality of mind," but that it is the power and operation of catholic faith within the man, accounted to him by God and his living Church, as the quickened seed and substance of all our heavenly graces.

As long, therefore, as the Oxford Divinity maintains its denial of the Catholic doctrine, in respect to the identity of principle between Christian faith and Christian holiness, and, at the same time, professes to "exclude sanctification from having any place in our justification," so long is the system justly chargeable with all the

countless evils of the Protestant imputation respecting the merits of the atonement. In vain will its adherents attempt to justify themselves from the multiplied contradictions of the reformers in regard to their doctrine of a double and two-fold faith, or in other words of their two Christian righteousnesses; whose very name, as it seems to us, grates harshly upon the ear, and,

"Like a wounded snake, drags its slow length along."*

The Oxford Divines, also, in support of their unscriptural distinction, and severance of justification from sanctification,—of Christian faith from Christian holiness,—by which they profess to keep aloof from Lutheranism on the one hand, and the Church of Rome on the other, maintain that there are *two formal* causes by which we are made just, in opposition to the canon of Trent, which teaches but one only, and declares that inherent justice is the *sole formal* cause of our justification. "We are," says Mr. Newman, "made *absolutely* (*!*) *acceptable* to God through the propitiatory indwelling of his Son, yet are not without the beginnings of *inherent acceptableness*, wrought in us by that indwelling." In other words, we are justified, partly, in an *absolute* sense, by the righteousness of Christ, and, partly, in an *inherent* sense, by a righteousness of "our own;" or, as is elsewhere expressed in the language of Mr. Newman, by "*both* at once!"

Here then we have plainly avowed the doctrine of a *two-fold* acceptableness, or of two kinds of Christian acceptableness, which Mr. Newman also, with other English divines, as we have seen, calls the two Christian righteousnesses.

* How can *the unity* of faith be preserved on such ground? The very arguments, indeed, by which we maintain the necessary visibility on earth of "one body," united in "one fold and one shepherd," we can also apply, with similar demonstration, against the above-named system of "two Christian righteousnesses." "But besides these evidences of Scripture," says a Protestant historian, "besides our own creed, which we say we have *from the Apostles*, there is the *reasonableness* of the thing. It is perfectly monstrous to suppose that there can be *two true faiths*. It cannot be; one of them *must be false*."—*Cob. Hist. of Reform., Letter 2. See also Dr. Wiseman "On the High Church Claims," passim.*

It must be acknowledged, however, that, while all the Protestant sects are agreed in their opinion on the nature of sanctifying justice, as being that of "our own inchoate righteousness,"* there is, notwithstanding, an extraordinary obscurity of exposition with regard to the imputed. We have seen that, by some, it is defined to be *absolute*, and by others to be one *in the abstract*, as contradistinguished from one in the concrete, and which they call "our own." Archbishop Usher, for example, accounts to us "the *absolute* integrity of our human nature" in Christ, as also the obedience which He *alone* "in that human nature of ours performed unto the whole law of God," and which, moreover, in his teaching, is imputed to *us* in the same *sense and manner* as He himself performed it in the days of his flesh! But we will not detain our readers on the glaring impiety of *such* an imputation to *us* of a work which could be accomplished by none but the Son of Man alone, and by no other, seeing that in Him it was finished according to its very letter,

Εξαλειψας το καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν.

But this, he says, is imputative righteousness as it is in the Articles of the Church of England.†

In Noell's Catechism, (which is considered as an authentic voucher for the doctrines of the English Church, and which was approved by the convocation in the reign of Elizabeth,) this reputative righteousness is also defined "to be *thoroughly absolute*," according to the "plumb line of God's law and judgment."

While all other Protestants, therefore, make only an *outward* imputation to us of the *absolute* righteousness of Jesus Christ, the Oxford Divines make the same a pro-

* Lectures on Justification, p. 414.

† While Bossuet exclaims against the impiety of this imputed righteousness, as it is proposed by the various reformed synods on the continent, what, we ask, would he not say of the expositions which we have given of the English divines, who teach that the immaculate Victim of Calvary was accounted by God *as a sinner*, in order that we might, according to *their* imputation, have his *absolute* justice made over to *us*, and be accepted, in the language of Hooker, as "more perfectly righteous than if we ourselves had fulfilled the whole law!"

pitiatory *indwelling*; and, at the same time, they add to it a sanctifying justice, which they call "an inchoate righteousness of our own."* For Mr. Newman moreover says, "In this I conceive to lie the unity of the Catholic doctrine, that we are saved by Christ's imputed righteousness, and by our own inchoate righteousness at once." Thus, while they endeavor to avoid the impiety of the ordinary or general doctrine of Protestantism on imputation, they have, on the other hand, through an anti-Roman principle of their own, most evidently fallen into one no less fatal than the celebrated heresy of Osiander himself. For the imputed righteousness, as taught by Mr. Newman, is no other than the essential justice of Jesus Christ's divinity, as held by the above-named reformer.†

This disciple of Luther, as is well known by Protestants as well as Catholics, signalized himself in the 16th century by a novel opinion of his own on justification, in teaching that the Christian's justifying righteousness was no other than the essential or absolute justice of the divine nature infused. And it is both curious and instructive to remark, that he attempted to prove his notion, on this article of faith, by the very same text, (viz. Jehovah our Righteousness,) which Bishop Andrews takes for his celebrated discourse on justification, which we have before noticed. The latter, as we have already remarked in a former page, is called by the Oxford writers, in Tract No. 71, "one of our wisest doctors and rulers." "As,"

* Lecture on Justification, p. 414.

† André Osiander se signala parmi les Luthériens, par une opinion nouvelle sur la justification: il ne voulait pas, comme les *autres Protestants* qu'elle se fit par l'imputation (seulement) de la justice de Jésus-Christ, mais par l'intime union de *la justice substantielle de Dieu* avec nos ames; il se fondait sur ces paroles souvent répétées en Isaïe et Jérémie; *Le Seigneur est notre justice.* Dans l'assemblée de Smalcade, on fut étonné de sa témérité; mais comme ou craignait de faire éclater de nouvelles divisions dans le parti, ou il tenait un *rang considérable* par son savoir, *on le toléra.*

Il ne fut pas plutôt en Prusse, qu'il mit en feu l'université de Konisberg, par *sa nouvelle doctrine sur la justification;* il partagea bientôt toute la province.—(*Mémoires des Egarmens de l'esprit humain*, Tome 2, pp. 307, 308. *Seckendorf, Hist. du Luth. Stockman, Bibl. German., loc. cit.*)

according to Osiander, "we live by God's substantial life and love, by the essential love he bears himself, so we are just by his essential justice communicated to us; to which the substance of the Word Incarnate, dwelling in us *by faith*,* is to be added."†

The difference between the two systems of Andrews and Osiander consists in this; viz. that while the former makes the essential, or absolute justice of God, ours externally, the latter makes it ours internally. But, as the Oxford Divines do not seem, in this particular, to follow the system of Andrews, the only difference between them and the doctrine of Osiander is, that while the latter held we are justified by the absolute justice within, together with the substance of the Incarnate Word, the former teach that we are, in like manner, justified within by the former, but then in connection with another of *our own*, or, in other words, partly by the one, and partly by the other at the same time; and in this, Mr. Newman says, he "conceives to lie *the unity* of the *Catholic* doctrine."‡

* Osiander, then, it appears, did not think it necessary to differ from other Protestants, as do the Oxford Divines, by excluding faith from his scheme of justification. But the latter, in order to avoid the extravagances of ultra-Protestantism on one hand, and "the bye-paths of Romanism," on the other, deem it indispensable to teach, that, since we are justified neither by faith alone, nor by works alone, we are, therefore, justified by Christ and our own righteousness *at once*.

† Bossuet's Var., Book 8, § 11.

‡ Of Osiander, Bossuet thus speaks: "Ever since the time that the Confession of Augsburg was in hand, he had used his utmost endeavors to prevail with the whole party to embrace this *prodigy of doctrine*, and, to Luther's face, defended it with the greatest boldness."—(*Hist. des Var.*, *Book* viii.) Melancton, who often found it his turn to praise him, nevertheless, in writing to his friends, censures "his extreme arrogance, his ravings, his other excesses, and the monstrousness of his opinions."—(*Lib.* 2, *Ep.*) "It was not," says Bossuet, "Osiander's fault that he did not go to trouble England, where he hoped that the esteem in which his brother-in-law, Cranmer, was held, would give him credit; but Melancton acquaints us that persons of authority and learning had represented the danger there was of bringing into that country a man who had spread in the Church so great a chaos of new opinions. Cranmer himself gave ear to reason on this head, and listened to Calvin, who spoke to him of the illusions whereby Osiander bewitched himself and others."—*Hist. des Var.*, *Book* 8, § 13.

Observe, now, the beauty and accuracy of the language with which the Council of Trent has *preserved*, instead of destroying, the scriptural principle of imputation, when she says, "et *non modo reputamur*, sed vere justi nominamur."* How different this from the doctrines of faith alone, or imputation alone, or mere human opinion, or, as in Oxford Divinity, the imputed righteousness of Christ in union with another of "our own!" But the doctrine of the unerring Council is that of *catholic* faith, of *catholic* imputation; and, therefore, she preserves in her definitions these scriptural truths, of which the Church of Rome is, without peradventure, the only infallible guardian and keeper.

Hence the above-named futile distinctions of Protestant reasoning are, one and all, declared by the Church of Rome to be but the mere traditions of a vain philosophy, and to have no better foundation than "the baseless fabric of a vision." In vain, therefore, shall we find in the creed or teaching of any sect or school whatever of Protestantism, or in the expositions of any of her individual divines, that *scriptural* imputation of our Redeemer's merits, or that catholic clearness and simplicity of its illustration, which is to be found, only, in the bosom of that body which is in Christian communion with the Holy See.

We cannot, therefore, conceive what Mr. Newman can intend or mean by the assertion that "it would seem as if there were two formal causes of justification admitted by Romanists—love or inherent righteousness, and grace or the presence of the Holy Spirit's indwelling."† For it is Mr. Newman and his associates who so strenuously uphold the distinction of two formal causes—a distinction so explicitly rejected by the Church of Rome in her "*unica formalis causa*," and from which the Oxford Di-

* The decree on this point is expressed as follows: "Demum *unica formalis* causa, est justitia DEI, non qua ipse justus est; sed qua nos justos facit: qua videlicet ab eo donati, renovamur spiritu mentis nostri, et *non modo reputamur*, sed vere justi nominamur, et sumus, justitiam in nobis recipientes, unusquisque suam secundum quam Spiritus sanctus partitur singulis prout vult, et secundum propriam cujusque dispositionem et cooperationem.—*Session* vi. *Cap.* vii.

† Lecture, p. 399.

vinity professes so cordially its dissent. The truth is, that the abandonment of the *double* righteousness by Protestantism would be, not only the death-blow to her visionary scheme of legal imputation, but a virtual declaration in favor of Catholic faith, and by necessary consequence, of Catholic unity and Roman supremacy.

While Mr. Newman protests against the *unica formalis causa* of the holy decree, he says again, "In this I conceive to lie *the unity* of the Catholic doctrine, that we are saved by Christ's imputed righteousness, and by *our own* inchoate righteousness *at once*."* Here, again, is not only an acknowledgment of a two-fold Christian righteousness, or of the two righteousnesses, as they are termed by Bishop Andrews, but of the imputed one, as distinguished from the inchoate, (which, we presume, means the inherent one,) and which, in perfect accordance with Protestant reasoning, is here, also, admitted to be *our own*.

With regard to the former, the question naturally arises, as to what is meant by its being here called imputed. Is it the same Protestant imputed righteousness, as we have before seen to be described by Hooker, and Andrews, and Beveridge, and others; or is it another species of imputation, peculiar only to the Oxford Divinity, for we once thought that Mr. Newman had abandoned the former kind? But since it is elsewhere defined the "absolute acceptableness,"† it can be no other than the one imputed by Hooker, who maintains that "the weakness of our faith were cause sufficient to shut us from the kingdom of heaven, where nothing (in his opinion) that is not *absolute* can enter;" and which *absolute* righteousness, moreover, according to him, can be obtained in no other way than by imputation.

Be this, however, as it may, it is an explicit recognition of a righteousness accounted, in contradistinction from one that is inherent; and how both, under such conditions, can be made one, or how we can be saved by both "*at once*," when they are also accounted by Mr. Newman himself to be separated both in kind, in char-

* Lectures, p. 414. † Lectures, p. 428.

acter, in substance, and, in short, under all possible relalations, is to us both strange and inconceivable.

We would, also, remark here, that Mr. Newman, besides maintaining *two formal* causes of justification, teaches that there are likewise *two instrumental* causes, and that of these, the one consists in Faith, and the other in Baptism! But, although he argues that there is nothing really inconsistent in this view, however such might appear, it does not seem that he attempts to defend it, as he does his other position, on the ground of a "Catholic Unity." In respect also to the two righteousnesses, it is to be noted, that they are represented as being each of them inward, while of the two instruments, the one is said to be inward, and the other outward. The following are his words: "There is nothing inconsistent, then, in faith being the *sole instrument* of justification, and yet baptism *also the sole* (*?*) instrument, and that at the same time, because in distinct senses; an inward instrument in no way interfering with an outward instrument."(!)*

Agreeably to this, then, baptism is the sole outward instrument, and faith the sole inward instrument. Now, since baptism is thus made by the Oxford school the sole outward instrument of our justification, and as *the terms* of their doctrine will not, it is certain, admit of *two sole outward* instruments, however they may reconcile the apparent inconsistency of holding two, on the ground of one being only outward, and the other only inward; we would, under these circumstances, ask, whether in their view, the Eucharist, also, is not to be considered as an outward instrument? But had we any doubts on this subject, they would be completely removed by the express statements of Dr. Pusey on the same. For, with Mr. Newman, he likewise holds there is but *one sole outward* instrument, and to this intent he quotes the above-cited passage as corroborative of his own views. And as it would, moreover, be too glaring a contradiction to teach that there were *two sole outward* instruments of our justification, it follows that they must, of necessity, exclude the Eucharist as an outward medium of the same.

* Lect. 10, p. 259. Also quoted by Dr. Pusey in his letter to the Bishop of Oxford, p. 44.

So far, moreover, is the contrary from being even pretended, in their view, that Dr. Pusey in his support of it, not only elevates baptism above the Eucharist, but makes a formal charge against the Church of Rome, with having "unduly exalted" the latter, and "doubly lowered" and "depreciated" the former.

"The chief charge," says Dr. Pusey, "against Rome, as to the sacrament of baptism, is not that she has unduly exalted it, but, on the contrary, that she has depreciated it. She insists, indeed, on its necessity, and there leaves it. Her members are taught to look upon baptism as a mere preliminary act, in *the background*, (?) as it were, of the Christian life; the foreground, upon which their eye is fixed, being taken up by their sacrament of penance and the Eucharist. As to holy baptism, Rome innovated not; and yet (!) she has *doubly lowered* it."*

Now, the Catholic Church, who they say has so much depressed baptism, by making the Eucharist their highest sacrament, and by not making the former, as do the Oxford Divines, the *sole* outward instrument, only makes it *an instrumental cause*† of our first justification; while she teaches that the other sacraments are outward media, also, either of its increase, its confirmation, or its renewal. While baptism, therefore, is held by her to be the first sacrament in the order of time, the Eucharist is the first in the order of grace and dignity. But the justice of Jesus Christ is, nevertheless, held to be the *only formal* cause, whether of our justification in time now, or in its never-failing increase in eternity hereafter.

But the Oxford Divines not only make baptism the sole visible *instrument*, but even the sole or only cause of our justification! For faith, they say, before the application of baptism, is not *living* faith. "It is then," says Mr. Newman, "without availing power, *without life* in the sight of God, as regards our justification,"‡ or "the indwelling of the Spirit"§—altogether "inoperative," and "nothing till Christ regenerates it" in baptism. Then, "when it comes *for baptism*, it is on the point of being *rid of itself*, and hid in Christ. It comes to the fount of

* Views of Baptism, p. 102.

† *Instrumentalis* item, sacramentum baptismi; quod est sacramentum fidei, sine *qua* nulli unquam contigit justificatio."—(*Cons. Trid. Sess.* vi. *Cap.* vii.)

‡ Lect. p. 275. § Ib. p. 277.

life to be *made alive*, as the dry bones in the prophet's vision were brought together in preparation for the breath of God to quicken them; and He who makes all things new, as he makes sinners righteous, &c., so also by his presence *converts* (*!*) what is a condition of obtaining favor into the means of holding and enjoying it."*

Thus, according to Mr. Newman, until faith is quickened into life, or before the reception of the sacrament, it is "mere faith," a principle without love, and, until baptized, is "not a virtue or grace; *else evil spirits*,"(*!*) he says, "could not possess it."(!) In this way, then, we are taught to make no difference *whatever*, before baptism, between the faith of those who have it along with a right disposition for the sacrament, and the naked or dead faith of "evil spirits."(!) Now this, be it remembered, is the very charge and calumny which Protestantism in general makes against the Church of Rome, by pretending or supposing that she teaches there can be no justification, and consequently no salvation, without the actual reception of the sacrament of faith, or, in other words, the holy rite of baptism. Because she alone, in contradistinction from *all* the sects of Christendom, teaches that baptism is *an instrumental* cause of our justification, and the justice of God in Christ its "only formal cause;" therefore it is, they say, that she denies salvation to all who have not received it, whatever be the unavoidable conditions of their lot, or whatever be the opportunities or dispositions which they may have for its reception. But this only is one among the many calumnies that are continually heaped upon the Church. For she teaches that the faith of the penitent catechumen is essentially the same before as after baptism. Without the faith necessary for the reception of the sacrament, she unquestionably teaches that there is no salvation; but, on the other hand, she has never, never taught, that the faith of the penitent catechumen is not essentially, or in substance, the same before as it is after baptism.

Let us attend now, for a moment, to the teaching of St. Augustine on this very point. We find him, then, in the first place, to say, that the catechumen *is really in*

* Lectures, pp. 277, 278.

the Church, wherein the evil spirits are not. Secondly, that a catechumen can be *excellentioris gratiæ*, and shows the same by eminent works of charity, which prove that he has the *formed faith*, or *habet fidem formatam*, which is vivified by charity. Thirdly, that all such can lose that grace by pride, and have all their sins upon themselves if they refuse to receive baptism. Fourthly, that baptism does forgive their sins. The following text from the same father, will prove his belief that a catechumen, with true humility, in case death should prevent him from being baptized, will be saved; and, therefore, that his faith is very far from being the same as, or like the faith of the evil spirits.*

"Baptismi sane vicem aliquando implere passionem, de latrone illo, cui non baptizato dictum est. Hodie mecum eris paradiso, non leve documentum idem beatus Cyprianus assumpsit: quod etiam atque etiam considerans, invenio non tantum passionem pro nomine Christi id, quod ex baptismo deerat posse supplere, sed etiam fidem,

* The following passage from St. Augustine, will illustrate these views of this truly great man in his own words; and while it shows them to be utterly at variance with the doctrine of Mr. Newman and Dr. Pusey on this subject, will be found to be in perfect accordance with the faith of the Church as expounded in her œcumenical councils.—"Futuri erant in *Ecclesia excelsioris gratiæ* catechumeni. Fit enim aliquando ut videas catechumenum abstinentem se ab omni concubitu, valefacientem sæculo, venuntiantem omnibus quae possidebat, distribuentem pauperibus, et catechumenus est instructus etiam forte doctrina salutari super multos fideles. Timendum est huic ne dicat apud semetipsum de baptismate sameto, quo peccata dimittuntur quid plus suscepturus sum? Ecce ego sum melior illo fideli, et illo fideli et meliorem se esse arbitrans quam ille qui iam baptizatus est, dedignetur venire ad baptismum dicens:—Hoc sum accepturus quod habet ille et ille; et proponat sibi illos, quos contemnit et quasi sordeat illi hoc accipere, quod acceperunt inferiores, quia iam videtur sibi melior: et tamen omnia peccata super illum sunt, et nisi venerit ad salutarem baptismum, ubi peccata solvuntur, cum omni excellentia sua non potest intrare in regnum cœlorum. Sed ut illam excellentram invitaret Dominus ad baptismum suum, ut peccata illi dimitterentur, venit ipse ad baptismum servi sui."—(*Augustinus Tractatus 4us in cap. 1um Ioannis.*)

We would also refer the reader to the funeral oration of St. Ambrose, *de Valentiniano*, as speaking the same mind on the subject as is expressed in the preceding extracts from St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas.

conversionemque cordis, si forte ad celebrandum mysterium baptismi in angustiis temporum succurri non potest."—(*St. Augustinus, De Baptismo contra Donatistas,* lib. v. cap. 21.)

The following text from St. Thomas Aquinas is plainer:—"Alio modo potest sacramentum baptismi alicus deesse *re* sed non *voto*, siut cum aliquis baptizari desiderat, sed aliquo casu prævenitur morte, ante quam baptismum susciperat, et talis sine baptismo actuali salutem consequi potest, propter desiderium baptismi quod procedit ex fide per dilectionem operante, per quam Deus interius hominem sanctificat, *cuino potentia sacramentis visibilibus non alligatur*."—(*St. Thom.*, 3, q. 68, art. 2.)

We beg the reader to observe here, that St. Thomas evidently teaches that the catechumen can have *formed faith*—fidem per dilectionem operantem; id est, *fidem formatam, sine qua* salvari non poterant.

Without true, or Christian faith, the Catholic Church unquestionably holds that no one can be justified or saved; nor, also, without the disposition for baptism. The words of the Synod of Trent being "sine lavacro regenerationis, aut *ejus voto*," &c.,* most plainly show, that the power of God, unto salvation and redemption, is not necessarily limited to the sacrament itself, but that one may, as St. Thomas expressly says, obtain salvation without actual baptism, by reason of its desire, which proceeds from faith working by love or charity, "*enim potentia*," he adds, "*sacramentis visibilibus non alligatur*."

But the Church, on the other hand, also teaches that, when and where the sacrament may be had, to such as neglect or despise it, under these circumstances, there can be no salvation; inasmuch as there can be, in such a case, no sound or true faith accompanied with charity, or, in the words of St. Thomas, no *fides formata*. Notwithstanding this teaching, how often do we hear that the Roman Church actually denies salvation to every man who dies without the actual reception of the baptismal sacrament; and that, too, because she is continually slandered with the imputation of holding that man is saved by baptism alone, and not by the faith and justice of Jesus Christ?

* Sess. vi. Cap. iv.

Now, if we were to consider faith as nothing else than a *mere act or habit* of the mind, or a *bare* quality of the intellect, as we have shown it to be held in the English Church from the days of Tyndale, her first apostle, according to Fox, to the period of Archbishop Usher, (and beyond,) which latter exhibits it to us as a *mere* instrument alone, under the metaphor of a "*bare* and *empty* (*!*) hand;" *then* would we also say, in the words of Mr. Newman, that this is "mere faith," and "not a virtue or grace, *else evil spirits could not possess it.*" So, indeed, distinguishes the admirable St. Thomas Aquinas. But this is *not* the distinction of Mr. Newman, while that of the former is the teaching of the Catholic or Roman Church, and, as we might expect, is formally repudiated in the professed *Via Media* of the Oxford school. For thus, again, Mr. Newman explains: "Devils believe and tremble. Thus, dread and despair are *the essential* properties of the devils' faith; *hope or trust of religious faith;* but both are in their nature one and the same faith, as being simply the acceptance of God's word about the future and unseen."*

On the other hand, while St. Thomas says to those who deny there is faith in devils, that this is contradicted by the words of St. James, in that "devils believe and tremble;" he further says that such faith, "quæ est in dæmonibus non est donum gratiæ," is but a *mere habit* of their natural intellect; and considered simply *as such and in that sense* alone, is the same as a *mere* habit in the Christian's own understanding, agreeably to his words, "unus et idem *habitus* est." But "hope or trust of religious faith" is *not*, according to St. Thomas, the "*essential* properties of the devils' faith," and therefore cannot essentially, or in substance, be "one and the same faith." With him, religious hope and trust belong to the faith of the penitent catechumen, such being a faith united to charity, which the devils have not.† So, also, says St. Augustine:—

* Lectures, p. 290.

† The reader's attention is requested to the following passages in detail, from St. Thomas, respecting the nature of faith in devils —*fides in dæmonibus.* The contrast between the doctrine of Oxford and that of St. Thomas, on this point, is certainly most striking and instructive.

"Ipsam fidem non facit utilem nisi charitas. Sine charitate quippe fides potest esse, sed non prodesse."*

The doctrine, therefore, of the Oxford school on this point, is nothing more nor less than an utter confounding of good with evil, and evil with good, and, consequently, of the Catholic faith, as held in the Roman Church, the only true mother of all the faithful. "For to this Church," as St. Irenæus says, "*on account of its superior headship*, (propter potiorem principalitatem,) every other must have recourse, that is, the faithful of all countries; in which Church has been preserved the doctrine delivered by the Apostles."†

"Videtur quod in dæmonibus non sit fides sed contra est quod dicitur—Jac. ii. v. 19. *Dæmones credunt et contremiscunt.*

"Respondeo dicendum quod intellectus credentis assentit rei creditæ, non quia ipsam videat, vel secundum se, vel per resolutionem ad prima principia per se visa; sed propter imperium voluntatis moventis intellectum. Quod autem voluntas moveat intellectum potest contingere ex duobus: *uno modo* ordine voluntatis ad bonum, et sic credere est actus laudabilis; *alio modo* quia intellectus convincitur ad hoc quod judicet esse credendum his quæ dicuntur, licet non convincatur per evidentiam sei; sicut si aliquis Propheta prænuntiaret in sermone Domini aliquid futurum, et adhiberet signum, mortuum suscitando; ex hoc signo convinceretur intellectus videntis, ut cognosceret manifeste hoc dici a Deo, qui non mentitur, licet illud futurum quod prædicitur in se evidens non esset. Unde per hoc ratio fidei non tolleretur.

"Dicendum est ergo, quod in fidelibus Christi laudatur fides secundum primum modum: et secundum hoc non est in dæmonibus, sed *solum secundo modo;* vident enim multa manifesta indicia, ex quibus percipiunt doctrinam Ecclesiæ a Deo esse, quamvis ipsi res ipsas, quas Ecclesia docet non videant, puta Deum esse trinum et unum, vel aliquid huiusmodi. * * * *

"Ad secundum dicendum quod *fides quae est donum gratiæ* inclinat hominem ad credendum secundum aliquem effectum boni, etiam si sit informis; unde fides quae est in dæmonibus *non est donum gratiæ*, sed magis coguntur ad credendum ex perspicacitate naturalis intellectus."—(*D. Thomas*, 22, q. 5, art. 2.)

"Charitas dicetur forma fidei in quantum per charitatem actus fidei perficetur et formatur."—(*St. Thomas*, 22, q. 4, art. 3, o.)

* Augustinus, de Trinitate, Lib. 15, cap. 18.

† Adv. Hær. L. c. p. 175. "So also Polycarp, instructed by the Apostles, and having conversed with many who had seen the Lord, was appointed by them Bishop of Smyrna."—Ibid, c. iv. p. 178.

St. Irenæus, though by birth a Greek, was Bishop of Lyons, in the second century; and in his youth had lived with St. Polycarp, the disciple of St. John the Evangelist. He left behind him a Treatise in five books, "against the heresies" of the age.

But the Oxford Divines, in professed opposition to the Roman doctrine, further maintain, that as there is not, nor can be any true justification before baptism, so there can be none after it in this life, if we should be so unhappy as to lose our baptismal grace or innocecne.*

But, to return to Mr. Newman's statement respecting our justification, in part, by "the imputed righteousness of Christ," and, in part, by "our own," we confess we cannot imagine how he could suppose the unity of the Catholic doctrine to lie in such a two-fold or double system of justification, especially, when we consider how strongly he protests against the Protestant theory of its outward or visionary imputation. We would, therefore, inquire what Mr. Newman actually means by "*our own* inchoate righteousness." If he conceives *this* to be the inherent justifying principle of Catholic doctrine, we can only say it is as widely apart from the faith of the Roman Church, as the north pole is from the south. And if the Oxford Divinity maintains the justification of man by "*our own* inchoate righteousness," however strong may be its rejection of Protestant imputation, it is, in reality, no other than a formal revival of the Pelagian principle, upon which the Catholic Church has so solemnly imposed her holy sentence of anathema.

Since Mr. Newman also acknowledges that this is not the doctrine of the Roman, nor yet that of the Protestant faith, but "a middle way," the *via media* only of the *English anti*-Protestant Church, the professed or so-called *Catholicity* of the Oxford Divines must, therefore,

S. Clement of Alexandria, of the Greek Church, who also lived in the second century, says that "the right doctrine is to be found only in the truth (or the true) and antient Church, *εν μονη τη ἀληθεια, και τη ἀρχαια ἐκκλησια.*"—*Strom.* l. vii. pp. 888, 890, 891, 899. *Edit. Oxonii*, 1715.

See also Tertullian of the L. C., who likewise flourished in the second century: "For where shall be found the true faith, there will be the *genuine* Scriptures; there the true interpretations of them; and *there all Christian traditions.*"—*De Prescriptione*, c. xvii. xix. xx. xxi. p. 334. Again, "If thou thinkest heaven is still closed, recollect that the Lord left the keys thereof to Peter, and through him to the Church."—*Scorpiaci*, c. x. p. 830. And let us ever bear in mind the promise of our Lord, that the gates of hell should never prevail against it.

* See Dr. Pusey's Letter, p. 62.

of necessity, exclude from its communion, not only the anti-Roman or Protestant Episcopal Church of these United States,* but, in fact, every other religious society

* But is it not, we ask, most evident that the statutes of Parliament, and, in particular, that famous Act of Henry in 1534, altogether deprives the Church of England of the name of *that Church* which is designated in the Apostles' Creed, as the Holy Catholic (or Universal) Church. The statute referred to is to be found in Collier's Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, vol. 2, part 1, book 2, and runs as follows : " Albeit the King's Majesty justly and rightfully is, and ought to be, Supreme Head of the Church of England, and is recognized by the clergy of this realm in their convocations ; yet nevertheless, for corroboration and confirmation thereof, and for increase of virtue in Christ's religion within the realm of England, and to repress and *extirpate all errors, heresies*, and other enormities and abuses heretofore used in the same : be it enacted by the authority of this present Parliament, that the King our Sovereign Lord, his heirs and successors, Kings of this realm, shall be taken, accepted, and reputed *the only Supreme Head on earth* of the Church of England, called *Anglicana Ecclesia*, and shall have and enjoy annexed and united to the imperial crown of this realm, as well the title and style thereof, as all honors, dignities, immunities, profits, and commodities, to the said dignity of Supreme Head of the said Church belonging and appertaining. And that our said Sovereign Lord, his heirs and successors, Kings of this realm, shall have full power and authority, from time to time, to visit, repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain and amend all such *errors, heresies*, abuses, contempts, and enormities whatsoever they be, which by any manner of *spiritual* (!) authority or jurisdiction, ought or may be lawfully reformed, repressed, ordered, redressed, corrected, restrained or amended, most to the pleasure of Almighty God, the increase of virtue in Christ's religion, and for the conservation of the peace, unity, and tranquillity of this realm, any usage, custom, foreign laws, foreign authority, prescription, or any thing or things to the contrary hereof notwithstanding."—Stat. 26, Hen. VIII, cap. 1. *Collier's History Ecclesiast. of Great Britain*, vol. 2, part 2, book 2.

Now as this act grants the King full power and authority to order and reform all errors, heresies, &c., and makes His Majesty, and by consequence those commissioned by him, judges of heresy, and invests them with the whole spiritual discipline, yet by the 20th article of this ecclesiastical establishment *the Church* is said to have *authority in controversies of faith.* While this article, then, pronounces *the Church* to be the judge in these matters, the aforesaid act, on the other hand, makes the King and those commissioned by him—the judges !—*Utrumque horum mavis accipe.* —But perhaps the inconsistency between the two documents may be reconciled on the ground that the article in question (the 20th) is, by some, not allowed to be genuine.

or body of men who have not, like the Oxford school, abjured the name of Protestantism. Is not, then, this very acknowledgment itself of "*a middle way*" between "the Roman" and "the Protestant,"* the most conclusive evidence of its fallacy? For where is there to be found on earth even a solitary society, under the name of Christian, unless it be connected with the Catholicity of the Roman Episcopate on the one hand, or with the variations of Protestant disagreement on the other?

But, as we have distinctly said before, the question of difference is, *not* whether the righteousness of Christ be imputed, or whether there is such a thing as his accounted righteousness, but, whether this is accounted to us in the unity of catholic spirit and truth, or otherwise, according to the vain and imaginary distinctions of a legal and Protestant imputation. The object of the reformers, as we have shown, has always been to darken the real end and merits of the controversy on this subject, and to represent, that, while they *alone* advocated the imputed righteousness of the Redeemer, the Church of Rome has ever stood forth as its prominent adversary, and as the advocate of our justification by that righteousness of the Jewish Scribes and Pharisees which was so emphatically denounced by our Lord in the days of his flesh.

So far, indeed, from having rejected the former righteousness, it is the Church of Rome only that has preserved and defended it, by her holy definitions, against the wild and visionary interpretation of the reformers. The council of Trent, while, as a light and a beacon to the whole world, it has shown, in the clearest and most conspicuous manner, the entire vanity of that legal imputation which has thrown so dark a veil over the merits of our Redeemer, has also held up to our view, that *Catholic and conservative imputation* of the unity of his righteousness, which can alone rescue it from the destroying doctrines of antinomian folly and delusion. Nevertheless, it is the main charge of Protestantism against the Church of Rome that she alone has repudiated the accounted righteousness of Christ, and denied

* Lect., p. 420.

the blessed merits of his atonement. And if ever there was a case to which the rebuke of the Apostle in the second chapter of his Epistle to the Romans might, in justice and in truth, be most appositely applied, it is to this very point of Protestant imputation in regard to the merits of the Christian atonement. "Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself: for thou doest the same thing which thou judgest.—For we know that the judgment of God is, according to truth, against them that do such things."*

That Jesus Christ is the meritorious cause of man's justification, is the universal profession of all nominal Christendom. This, then, is not the question at issue between Protestants and Catholics. Mr. Faber says, along with all the English Divines we have cited, that the peculiar distinction on this point, of the Church of England and all the Reformed Churches, consists in nothing more nor less than a bare or outward imputation of our Lord's justice to man, in order to render him just, in the place of its inward application, according to the Church of Rome.†

Mr. Newman again, in endeavoring to defend the distinction maintained by the Oxford Divinity against the Church of Rome, in *her* doctrine of justification, goes on to say, that "our divines, though of very different schools, have, with a very few *exceptions*, agreed in this, that justification is gained by obedience in the shape of faith."‡ But this, as we have before shown by our citations from their writings, does not determine the merits of the point at issue. The only question is, how and in what manner is this obedience, professedly admitted by all, accounted to us for our salvation? This, Mr. Newman answers, is done according to "the doctrine of *two righteousnesses*, perfect and imperfect; not the Roman, that obedience justifies without a continual imputation of Christ's merits; nor the Protestant, that imputation justifies distinct from obedience; but a middle way, that

* Rom. ii., 1, 2.
† Faber's Prim. Doct. of Justif., Pref. xviii. 20.
‡ Lec., p. 420.

obedience justifies in, or under Christ's covenant, or, sprinkled with Christ's meritorious sacrifice."*

On the question, therefore, which relates to the imputation of Christ's obedience, Mr. Newman expressly denies the unity of Christian righteousness, by his maintenance of two instead of one only, which can possibly be accounted to the creature, according to the writings of the Apostles, and which are in direct opposition to the statements of all the English divines of a "double righteousness" a system, in respect to which they say, that "the wit of man," in the words of Bishop Andrews, "can devise no more."

That this doctrine of the Oxford Divinity is "*not the Roman*," as Mr. Newman says, is most certain, but he most grievously errs in asserting its Church to hold "that obedience justifies without a continual imputation of Christ's merits." This, as we have before said, is the hackneyed charge of Protestantism against the Catholic faith, but which, we trust, we have already shown to be unsupported by the slightest shadow of evidence.

With regard now to the assertion that "the doctrine of two righteousnesses" is *not the* Protestant, does not so fully appear, unless we are to account all the English divines we have quoted, as a class *sui generis*, or, in other words, neither "Protestant nor Roman," and which, of course, would be a species of Catholicity excluding from its pale *all known societies whatever* under the Christain name or profession.† But the Protestant doc-

* Lec., p. 420.

† It is evident that the *Protestant* Episcopal Church of the United States would, of course, be excluded from the limits of the English establishment, were this sort of Catholicity admitted to be the characteristic of her faith. But the very statute itself of Henry to which we have before adverted is alone an effectual bar to the validity of her pretensions. Admitting the contrary, however, for the sake of argument, and seeing that there ever have been and still are serious controversies *de fide* between the different divines, and schools of divines, in the English Church as "by law established," and of which establishment the Protestant Episcopal Church of these United States claims to be *a branch*, (!) according to its doctrine that the former is the Church *Catholic*, (!) in spite of the English statute (of Henry VIII.) which expressly disclaims this pretension; what good reason, we ask, can be shown

trine is here stated to be, that "imputation justifies distinct from obedience." Now, we are sure that no Pro-

to prevent the assembly of a general council, under its so-called spiritual supremacy, in order to determine and settle these grievous controversies? The answer is obvious, and we will not, therefore, detain our readers on the question. But let us rather attend to a comment, by one of *her own* bishops, on the spirit and principles of the above-named statute; though we think it will not be an easy task to reconcile the claim of the *Branch* in this country with the sovereign declaration of the former, whether we interpret according to the law of the British Parliament, or according to the law of Christ and his Apostles.

"Our great Lord and Master," says Bishop Sparrow of the English Church, "having purchased to himself by his precious blood, a peculiar people, *his one mystical* body the Church, sanctified it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, holy, without spot.—Ephes. v. 27. That the Church might preserve herself in this purity without spot, and in this unity without division, and continue *one* holy Church, as it is in our creed, a double power and authority is needful,—one of jurisdiction, to correct and reform those impure members by spiritual censures, whom counsel will not win, and if they be incorrigible, to cast them out of this holy society, 'lest their leaven should leaven the whole lump.'—1 Cor. v. 6. Besides this power of jurisdiction, there is also necessary a legislative power to make canons and constitutions upon emergent occasions. Without a definite and authoritative sentence, *controversies will be endless*, and the Church's peace unavoidably disturbed, and therefore the voice of God and right reason hath taught, that in matters of controversy *the definitive sentence should decide the doubt*, and whosoever should decline from that sentence, and do presumptuously, should be put to death, that others might hear and fear, and do no more presumptuously, (Deut. xvii.) which is to be understood mystically, also, of death spiritual *by excommunication*, by being cut off from the living body of Christ's Church.

This authority in determining doubts and controversies, the Church hath practised *in all ages*, and *her* constant practice is *the best interpreter* of her right. We read not only of St. Paul's determining controversies about rules and circumstances, (1 Cor. xiv.) but also of the Church's determining controversies of doctrine and matters of belief in a full council, (Acts xv.) and requiring submission to those determinations from inferior members. The like did the Church afterwards in her general councils of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon. And not only the general councils have exercised this authority, but particular churches also in national councils, in the council of Orange, Milevis, and others, have used the same power over their children, whom they were bound to teach and govern, and for whose souls they were to account to God; and they did no more than was their right, so long as they did it *with submission to the general Church* to whom they are subject. Christ said to the Apostles, and by this

testant divine, out of the Oxford school, would admit the truth of this allegation. No, the ingenious system of the reformers on imputation is too well understood by its leading advocates, that they should contend we are justified by mere imputation alone, without the obedience of Christ. On the contrary, they would declare, one and all, that we are justified only by the accounted righteousness or obedience of Christ. Not one of them, we are persuaded, would make their imputation distinct from his obedience. They would boldly aver that we are saved only by Christ's imputed righteousness, and not, according to the Oxford Divinity, by this and "our own inchoate righteousness at once." Were this, then, *all* they held and said, there would, we answer, be nothing to object. But when we ask how, and in what manner, they account the righteousness of Christ, then they refer us, it would seem, to their cardinal distinction of what they term the *two kinds*, viz., *the one* for Christian justice, and *the other* for Christian holiness, and which, with the "judicious" Hooker, they say, "St. Paul doth plainly sever one from the other."*

Mr. Newman, therefore, greatly errs in attributing, both to Catholics and to Protestants, doctrines that would be immediately disavowed by both. "But the middle way that obedience justifies in," under the Oxford theology is, as far as we can understand it, no other than the same Protestant way under another name, so long as the reformed doctrine of the two Christian righteousnesses

to all the guides of souls that should succeed them in *a lawful ordination*, 'He that hears you, hears me, and he that despises you, despises me.'—St. Cyprian, ep. 69." (*Preface to his Book of Canons.*)

In conformity with the above teaching of Bishop Sparrow, we would here remark, that the reason why the creed of St. Athanasius was refused admittance in the liturgy of "the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States," when, in the preface to her Book of Common Prayer, an acknowledgment is made of her indebtedness to the Church of England "for her *first* foundation," still remains for her to explain. By the way, it is very certain that her *second* foundation, in this country, could no more be made upon Christ and his Apostles, than her *first*. The statute of Henry claims *but one* foundation, while the daughter in the United States acknowledges *two*. Under these circumstances, it is not easy to perceive how the *unity* can well be maintained.

* Hooker on Justification, § 6.

is maintained in opposition to the Catholic faith of one only, in the true and undivided obedience of our Lord in the unity of all his faithful members.

As an illustration of the doctrine of Catholic imputation, we would propose the following catechism on this point, according to the expositions of the Council of Trent.

Ques. Does the Catholic creed deny the accounted righteousness of Jesus Christ?

Ans. God forbid. For how then could we be justified by his justice according to the Scriptures?

Ques. Are we not justified then by faith, according to the words of the Apostle?

Ans. Yes.

Ques. In what way?

Ans. By its being accounted to us for our righteousness.

Ques. Are we not justified then by faith alone?

Ans. No; because there is no such *Christian* faith.

Ques. In what way, then, is faith accounted to us?

Ans. By the perfect obedience of Jesus Christ.

Ques. Are there then two Christian righteousnesses—the one perfect, and the other imperfect?

Ans. There is but one only; i. e. the perfect or *catholic* principle of faith itself,* or, in other words, that divine

* We have already seen that faith *itself* is, by all the English divines whom we have quoted, represented as "nothing worth," or, no more deserving of true merit, than "the *good* works of a justified man," according to their nomenclature. Indeed the Protestant sects, one and all, teach that both faith *itself* and *good* works *themselves* are intrinsically worthless, and totally devoid of all merit in God's sight, since they maintain that they are but merely *our own* doings, and not supernatural actions of God's power in and upon the creature, according to the exposition of the Catholic Church. As they do not, therefore, admit that they are the fruits of the divine and justifying presence within, it is not surprising they should reject their justifying efficacy; but it certainly is to be wondered at, that with this idea of their entire destitution of true merit, they should, however, believe that we are *nevertheless sanctified* by them. Here, indeed, is a difficulty which none of them have ever been able to reconcile, and some of their divines, when asked for an explanation, waive it by the mere acknowledgment of its being a *vexed question* with which they have no inclination to meddle.

Bossuet, in his exposition of the doctrine of the Catholic Church,

and mysterious gift of which Jesus Christ is both the Author and the Finisher.

Ques. Are we sanctified, then, by the same kind of obedience or faith by which we are justified?

Ans. Yes; as it is written, that we are both "sanctified by faith," and "justified by faith."

Ques. Have we, then, no better reason for asserting that there are two Christian righteousnesses, than we would have for the assertion that there were three Gods?

Ans. None whatever.

Ques. In what way is the unity of our blessed Redeemer's righteousness accounted to us?

Ans. By the decision of Trent, it is imputed to us, not in name only, but in spirit and in truth.

Ques. Does not, then, the Catholic doctrine most sacredly maintain a true and actual imputation to us of the justice or righteousness of God in Jesus Christ?

Ans. Yes; for the words of the Council declare that by it, *non modo reputamur, sed vere justi nominamur;* and, in the same manner, we can say, that we are not only named just by God under the Christian covenant, but we are also truly so accounted; not, however, on a carnal reckoning of man's conceit, by a supposed and finished sentence of the law, but only by the unity of catholic faith and true Christian obedience.

Now, a catechism constructed according to the declared principles of the Oxford theology, would naturally be as follows:—

Ques. Does this creed admit or profess an imputed righteousness of Christ?

Ans. It does.

says, "Sur le mérite des œuvres, l'Eglise catholique enseigne, que la vie éternelle doit être proposée aux enfans de Dieu, et comme une grace qui leur est miséricordieurement promise par le moyen de notre Seigneur-Jesus, et comme une récompense qui est fidèlement rendue à leurs bonnes œuvres et à leur mérites, en vertu de cette promesse: ce sont les propres termes du concile de Trente." —(*Sess.* 6, *C.* 6.)

"Mais de peur que l'orgueil humain ne soit flatté par l'opinion du mérite présomptueux, ce même concile enseigne que tout le prix et la valeur des œuvres chrétiennes provient de la grâce sanctifiante qui nous est donnée gratuitement, au nom de Jésus-Christ, et que c'est *un effect de l'influence continuelle* de ce divin chef sur ses membres."

Ques. Is it *only* by this righteousness that we are saved?

Ans. No.

Ques. What then, is there *another* righteousness besides this, by which we are also saved?

Ans. Yes.

Ques. How is this other kind defined?

Ans. *Our own* inchoate righteousness.

Ques. Are there, then, *two* Christian righteousnesses, each one, distinct, in kind and character, from the other?

Ans. Yes; for according to the English divines, "there be," in the words of Hooker, "two kinds of Christian righteousness;" who also says that "St. Paul doth plainly sever these two parts (and kinds) of Christian righteousness one from the other."

Ques. Since we are saved, then, partly by Christ's imputed righteousness, and partly by our own, in what manner is this effected?

Ans. By "both at once."

Ques. Is this doctrine by the authority of the Church?

Ans. "Not the Roman, nor the Protestant."

Ques. How, then, is it maintained?

Ans. By "a middle way under Christ's covenant."

Ques. By what law is this plan of salvation accounted or reckoned; is it by the law of faith, or by the law of works?

Ans. By neither exclusively, but partly by the one, and partly by the other; or, in other words, by "*both at once.*"

Such, then, is the plan of the Christian covenant by Oxford imputation, and according to the *via media* of their system, as contradistinguished from the Protestant doctrine of imputation on one hand, and the Catholic on the other. It is plain, therefore, that no one can, *consistently*, hold the unity of the true, or Roman Catholic faith on this point, unless by an *entire* abandonment, in *all respects*, of the reformed or Protestant doctrine of imputation, and that not in name or profession *only*, but in substance and in fact.* On the authority, therefore, of

* So confident, indeed, do the Oxford writers feel in regard to their own position on this ground, that we are not surprised to find them speaking in the following language :—

the Catholic Church, we confidently affirm that, as long as the Oxford Divines continue to maintain their unholy severance of justification from sanctification, in opposition to the Roman faith, just so long will they contribute to lend the weight of their learning and example to the poisoned source of all the discordant and melancholy variations of the reformed and anti-Catholic religion.

It must be acknowledged, however, that, although the Oxford Divines attempt to maintain *their* distinction between justification and sanctification against the Church of Rome, by a sort of middle way peculiar to themselves, it is, by no means, so plausible or ingenious as the mode in which this is done by the English Divines to which we have before referred. And it is not, moreover, a little remarkable, that although the faith of Luther was diametrically opposed to every principle of *Catholic*

"Be assured of this, no party will be more opposed to our doctrine, if it ever prospers and *makes noise*, than the Roman *party*.(!) This has been proved before now. In the *seventeenth century, the theology of the divines of the English Church was substantially the same as ours is;* and it experienced the full hostility of the Papacy. It was the *the true Via Media;* Rome sought to block up that way as fiercely as the Puritans. History tells us this. In a few words, then, before we separate, I will state some of my *irreconcilable differences* with Rome as she is; and in stating her errors, I will closely follow the order observed by *Bishop Hall* in his treatise on The Old Religion, *whose Protestantism* is unquestionable.

"I consider that it is unscriptural to say, with the Church of Rome, that we are 'justified by inherent righteousness.'

"That it is unscriptural that '*the good* works of a man justified do *truly merit* eternal life.'" &c., &c.—(*Tract* No. 38, p. 11, *and quoted by Dr. Pusey.*)

In relation to Bishop Hall, whose name is so zealously appealed to in the above, and whose doctrine, or rather, as it is there said, "whose Protestantism is unquestionable," we have to remark here that he is the *same* prelate whose views of imputation we have before given in several passages from his writings.

It may not, also, be amiss to repeat, that he is the author of the celebrated work entitled, (by the way, not in very good taste,) "No Peace (!) with Rome."

"I might add," continues the Oxford writer, "*other* points in which *also* I protest against the Church of Rome, but I think it *enough* to make *my confession in Hall's* order, and to leave it."—(Ibid. p. 11, *and quoted by Dr. Pusey.*)

We would, therefore, request the reader who is anxious to know more of the views of Bishop Hall on this, to turn to our former extracts from his writings at pages 71—74.

faith, even he never ventured upon an open declaration of any such distinction, in substance, as was since, and is now maintained by Protestantism on these articles of Christian doctrine.*

* " Lorsque Luther attaqua les indulgences, il s'était introduit de grands abus dans l'Eglise, il était nécessaire de les réformer ; c'est une vérité reconnue par les Catholiques les plus zélés. Mais l'Eglise Catholique n'enseignait point d'erreurs, et sa morale était pure : on a défié cent fois les Protestants de citer un dogme ou un point de discipline contraire aux vérités enseignés dans les premiers siècles, ou opposé à la pureté de la morale évangélique.

" On pouvoit donc se garantir des abus et distinguer la morale de l'Evangile (or the faith of the Church) de la corruption du siècle, laquelle, il faut l'avouer, avait étrangement *infecté tous les ordres de l'Eglise*, qui cependant ne fut jamais destituée d'examples éclatans de vertus et de sainteté.

" Une infinité de personnes, plus savantes que Luther, et d'une piété éminente, souhaitaient la réforme des abus, et la demandaient ; mais elles croyaient que c'était à *l'Eglise même* à procurer cette réforme, et que la corruption même du plus grand nombre des membres de l'Eglise n'autorisait *aucun particulier* à faire cette réforme.

"¡Il n'y avait donc aucune raison de se séparer de l'Eglise, lorsque Luther s'en sépera. La réforme que Luther etablit, consistait *à détruire* toute la hiérarchie ecclésiastique ; il enseigna des dogmes qui, de l'aveu de *ses sectateurs même*, détruisaient les principes de la morale et sapaient tous les fondemens de la religion naturelle et révélée : tels sont ses sentimens sur la liberté de l'homme, et sur la prédestination.

" Luther entreprit cette réforme sans autorité, sans mission, soit ordinaire, soit extraordinaire ; il n'avait pas plus de droit que les Anabaptistes, qu'il refutait en leur demandant d'où ils avaient reçu leur mission ; il n'avait mis dans sa réforme, *ni la charité ni la douceur* qui caracterisent un homme envoyé de Dieu pour reformer l'Eglise : *son emportement*, *sa dureté*, *sa présomption*, révoltaient tous ses disciples ; il avait violé ses vœux, et il s'était marie scandaleusement ; il avait autorisé la polygamie dans le landgrave de Hesse ; ses écrits n'ont ni dignité, *ni décence ;* ils ne respirent ni la charité, *ni l'amour de la vertu ;* il s'abandonne avec complaisance aux plus indécentes railleries."—*Mémoires, &c. des egaremens de l'esprit humain, &c.*, Tome ii, pp. 303, 304.

That this is not mere declamation, those who have read the writings of Luther, and the history of his reform by *Protestant* historians, will abundantly testify. We have no objection, therefore, to appeal, in behalf of its truth, to the testimony of moderate Protestants, of Luther's own letters, sermons, and other works, and even to Melancton and Erasmus themselves.

When Luther, moreover, saw those grievous abuses and corruptions of discipline, which all virtuous Catholics most deeply deplored, should he not have reasoned with himself and with counsellors in the following argument of the inspired Apos-

But such, however, is the character or nature of the reformed faith, and such the peculiar mode of its imputation, that it was afterwards found indispensably necessary to defend it by the arbitrary distinctions of the two righteousnesses, as held by Hooker, Andrews, Usher, and others, in order to maintain the ground that had been already taken against the Catholic Church, and thus to justify their departure or schism from the unity of the Christian commonwealth. For it does not appear that either Luther or Melancton was aware of the consequences to which it would be necessary to resort in order to uphold the plausibility of their novel and unauthorized tenets.* Bossuet says, that "Those subtle distinctions between justification and regeneration or sanctification, in which," at his day, "*the whole nicety of the Protestant doctrine was placed*, were born after them, and since the Confession of Augsburg." "The Lutherans," he continues, "*now* acknowledge that these things were confounded by Luther and Melancton. Even in the Apology, so authentic a work of the whole party, Luther indeed thus defines justifying faith. 'True faith is the work of God in us, by which we are renovated and born again of God and the Holy Ghost. And *this faith is that true justice* (or righteousness) which St. Paul calls

tle, "what if some did not believe," or act as faithful Catholics ought to have done conformably with a right sense of Christian duty, "shall their unbelief" and unchristian conduct "make void *the faith of God*," or, frustrate the promises he has delivered to his holy and immutable Church; ought they to forget the words of his own lips, that he himself should be with her to the end of time, and that the gates of hell should not prevail against her?

Such a course would have been the dictate of a most worthy policy, an earnest of sincere desire for lawful reform, and an unquestioned evidence of unfeigned humility and Christian fortitude. In so doing, they would have appealed to the wisdom and authorities of the Church, according to the prescribed and consecrated rules of her hierarchy. They would have felt themselves bound to discountenance the practice of all immorality and scandal among her priesthood, by every lawful expedient, and by their example, to have shunned such evil as a moral pestilence within her sacred walls; while, on the other hand, they would have remembered the awful vengeance of God against the disobedience and rebellion of Korah and his company, for which his holy anger caused the earth to swallow some, and fire from heaven to consume the rest.

* Solid. Répét. Conc., p. 686. Epist. artic. Ibid. 185.

the justice of God, and which God approves.' By *this*, therefore, (continues Bossuet,) we are both justified and regenerated or sanctified *at the same time*; and, since the Holy Ghost, that is, *God himself acting in us*, interposes in this work, it is *no imputation out of us*, as Protestants will *now* have it, but a work *within us*."*

What an explicit recognition is this, by Bossuet, of the doctrine of *Catholic imputation!* What a striking comment upon the dogma of Trent, and of her ancient Church! And what decisive evidence, moreover, does it not furnish against the perpetual and daily calumnies of Protestantism—*that the Church of Rome denies the imputed righteousness of Jesus Christ!* What she denies on this point, as we have before repeated, is the Protestant and judicial, but not the Catholic or Apostolic imputation of St. Paul. In this work it is God himself who interposes. As Bossuet remarks, "it is no imputation *out of us*, as Protestants will *now* have it, but a work *within us*." "But what is most remarkable," he says, in allusion to the doctrine of the reformers, "is that it everywhere supposes errors in the Catholic Church, which errors were always detested by her; so that they seemed rather to have sought a subject for quarrelling than reforming, and this will appear manifest upon expounding historically the belief of the one and the other."

We are, therefore, altogether at a loss to conceive how Mr. Newman could affirm in the statement we have before quoted, that the Roman Church, in her doctrine of "obedience, justifies *without* a continual imputation of Christ's merits," when he maintains that along with his imputed justice we are, at the same time, "saved by *our own* inchoate righteousness." Mr. Newman must have forgotten that the early reformers everywhere ascribed to themselves the *exclusive* honor of the contrary doctrine of our salvation by a free and gratuitous gift, and reproached Catholics "that *they* believed they obtained their forgiveness of their *own* works; that *they* believed they could merit by their *own* strength,"—"that they taught no other justice than that of (mere natural) reason,"

* Præf. in Epist. ad Rom. t. v. f. 97, 98.

—"that they could draw near to God by their *own* proper works, independently of the propitiation of Jesus Christ, and that they had dreamt of a justification without speaking one word of him; and in fine, that they *had buried Jesus Christ*."*

But strange it is, that notwithstanding these reproaches, it is the Catholic faith only which, by its maintenance of only one Christian righteousness, effectually shuts the door against the fatal error of attributing in any way to man the work of his salvation by his "own inchoate righteousness," or indeed in any other conceivable manner than by the one only and truly accounted righteousness of Jesus Christ, independently of any supposed act of the creature's *own* faith, or any imputative sanctification of *his own* works. But such, however, is the character and necessary tendency of the Protestant imputation, that all history and experience has proved, in the clearest manner, that it is altogether impossible for the followers of the reformers to support it, except by maintaining the doctrine that our most holy faith consists in *mere opinion*, and our inherent righteousness in a personal holiness of *our own*.

How striking, then, is the analogy of the above reasoning to that of the Jewish scribes and Pharisees in *their* interpretations of the faith of Abraham! What was it, in fact, but this very same righteousness of Jehovah, expounded by the Apostles, not according *to the letter* of the law, but after the teaching of the Holy Ghost, which constituted, in the eyes of the ancient Rabbi, that stone of stumbling over which *they* and their nation fell? "Why so? Because they sought it not of faith, but, as it were, of works; for they stumbled at the stumbling-stone; as it is written: Behold I lay in Sion a stumbling-stone and a rock of scandal, and whosoever believeth in him shall not be confounded."

"To me it is good," says the celebrated Catechist of Alexandria, "to draw intelligence from the Scriptures, according to the sense that has been delivered by Apostolical tradition.—(*Secundum ipsorum traditionem intelli-*

* Vide Bossuet's Work on the Variations. Also, Conf. Aug. Art. xx. Apol. Cap. de justif. Conc. p. 61. Ibid. pp. 62, 74, 102, 103,

gentiam capere.)—If we follow the *mere letter* of the Scriptures, and take the *interpretation* of the law, *as the Jews commonly explain it*, I shall blush to confess that the Lord should have given such laws. But if the law of God be *understood as the Church teaches*, then truly does it transcend all human laws, and is worthy of him that gave it."—*Hom.* vii. *in Levit.*, T. 11, p. 224, 226.

For "the law," says the Apostle, had only "a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things."—(Heb. x. 1.) But now since faith itself has come to us in the tradition of the Apostles, to whom it was once delivered by our Lord, are we to interpret its immutable doctrines according to the mere shadow and letter of the law? Such an interpretation, indeed, would well become the corrupt traditions of the Synagogue after the mere inheritance of the law. But the inheritance of truth is now secured and continued to us in the Church by the infallible promise of its invisible Head. The true faith, therefore, which was taught by Jesus Christ, continues now, of necessity, in the expositions of his infallible interpreter. For "that alone is truth," says Origen, "which in nothing differs from ecclesiastical and Apostolical tradition."*

But, says Mr. Newman, in regard to the peculiar interpretation of his own school, "If this line of argument can be maintained, there will be this especial force in it as addressed to Romanists. They are accustomed to taunt us with inconsistency, as if we used the tradition of the Church only when, and as far as we could avoid it. We do not discard the tradition of the Fathers; we accept it; we accept it entirely; we accept its witness concerning itself and *against itself.* It witnesses its own inferiority to Scripture."†

As to such a tradition, which bears witness in itself of its own inferiority to the authority of Scripture, we can only say it is not the Apostolic tradition spoken of as above, by Origen, and is, therefore, repudiated by the Church of Rome, as belonging only to the spurious traditions of mere men, and of which our learned teacher

* Præf. lib. 1. Periarchon, T. 1, p. 47.
† Newman on Romanism, p. 349.

again remarks, that he would "blush to confess that the Lord should have given such laws." It is needless, therefore, to say any thing further on the merits of a tradition which witnesses "*against itself!*" With respect, however, to apostolical tradition it may be truly said, that

> The genuine "sense is hard to flesh and blood,"
> "But nonsense never can be understood."

Moreover, we cite the testimony of Origen, not that his single individual interpretation, or that of any of the Fathers, is *conclusive* as to the doctrines or authority of Scripture, but we appeal to him as an impartial witness to the existence in the Church of a unanimous consent, or infallible tradition, which always has been there, is now, and ever will be,

> Ἓις τ'αν υδωρ τε ρεη και δενδρεα μακρα τεθηλη.

But what, we here ask, is the main design and end of the Protestant system of imputation respecting the merits of the Atonement? Let us hear the acknowledgment from Archbishop Usher himself, who in his "Body of Divinity," has thrown this matter for his readers into the form of a catechism.

"What gather you," says he, "from this (forensic) doctrine of justification by Christ's righteousness?

"*Ans.* 'To condemn the proud opinion of Papists, who seek justification by their *own* works, and righteousness inherent in themselves.'"

And again, in allusion to his doctrine of "faith *alone*, not considered" (by him) "as a virtue inherent in us working by love," but only, according to his words, as a "poor, mean, barren, and empty" principle of *our own*, and the *mere* instrument of our imputed righteousness, he says:

"What gather we from hence?

"*Ans.* 'First the folly of the Popish doctors, who persuade the multitude to rest in a *blind* faith, which they call implicit and folded up: telling them it is enough for them to believe *as the Church believes*, though they know

not who the Church is, whereas the Scripture teaches us that faith cometh by hearing."*

* So, also, in the same vituperative strain, speaks Mr. Newman. "For in truth," he says, "she is a church *beside herself*, abounding in noble gifts and rightful titles, but unable to use them religiously; crafty, obstinate, wilful, malicious, cruel, unnatural, as *madmen are*, or rather, she may be said to resemble a *demoniac (!)* *ruled within by an inexorable spirit.*"—*Newman on Romanism*, p. 102, 103.

Such, indeed, was the charge of the Jewish rulers against the person of its very founder and author, Jesus Christ himself, who is the chief corner-stone and invisible Head of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. He hath, said they, a devil, and casts out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of devils. But this is no marvel, for such has ever since been the charge against his living church by all her enemies. So has she always been contemned, as a "sect everywhere spoken against." If men, therefore, persecuted their King in the days of his flesh—even Jesus the Nazarene—"it is enough for his disciples that they be as their Master, and the servants as their Lord." And "if they have called the Master of the House Beelzebub," and said of him that he is mad and hath a devil, "how much more them of his household!"

Doubtless, the "much learning" and consecrated wisdom of Trent, appears to its contemners, as did that of the eloquent Paul to the mind of the astounded Festus. We will, therefore, reply to our Oxford opponents, that she is not mad, but speaks the words of soberness and truth.

But by whom is the charge made that she is *mad*, and "may be said to resemble a *demoniac?* (!) We answer, by those whose very system obliges them to teach, that the faith of the penitent catechumen, before his baptism, and the dead faith of demons, are in their own nature one and the same faith, and, consequently, if men should once lose the grace of their sole or only justifying sacrament, that there remains not for them, according to the commission of their Church, any certain remedy or recovery from the deadness of their faith, until the day of judgment. Thus teaching the unhappy penitent this sad and disconsolate lesson, that his last state is, now, even worse than was his first, before the reception of his baptism. Could the spirit of error, indeed, be more extravagantly confounded with the spirit of truth than is attempted in the above-named system?

Now, from those who teach such destroying doctrines, it is almost needless to remark, that the grievous charge we have referred to, against the Church of Rome, comes with a singularly bad and ungracious manner. For, can we not say of both, and either of these monstrous tenets, as Bossuet does, in respect to the extraordinary confessions of the Synod of Dort, "could Jesus Christ be associated with Belial, grace with sin, in a more flagrant manner?"—*Hist. des Var.*, vol. 2, book xiv.

May we not, then, appropriately style the two opposite and ultra errors of these conflicting sects, the Scylla and the Charybdis of

Here, then, we have not only a confession of the main design of Protestantism in upholding the leading and prominent doctrine of her cause, but a specimen, also, of her gratuitous and unfounded misrepresentation of the real and actual principles of the Catholic Church. Who, then, we ask, among Catholic divines, ever denied that "faith cometh by hearing;" but who is there so ignorant as not to know that the matter at issue is *not* on such a point, but simply on the question whether its teaching depends upon the above-named interpretation of the Anglican doctors, or upon the authorized voice and declaration of the Church herself, who, while she disclaims the charge of holding a justification by our own works, at the same time repudiates the equally pernicious doctrine, that we are, in *any degree*, or in any manner, sanctified by a righteousness of *our own?**

Since the Oxford writers, however, affirm that the divines of their establishment, though of very different schools as they admit, have, with a very few exceptions, agreed in holding the doctrine of two righteousnesses, it certainly is not unimportant to the question to determine what are the two upon which it is thus held that they are united. In entering, however, upon an inquiry of this nature, a difficulty immediately presents itself which we find it impossible to remove.

We beg, however, to remark, in the first place, that all *Protestant* writers, indeed, without a single exception, that we have met with, seem to be firmly agreed on the doctrine that there are *two formal causes*, in the place of

Protestant extravagance? Nevertheless, each claims the middle and the golden way, and all flatter themselves with their own obedience to the precept of "In mediâ tutissimus ibis."

* And what is such a doctrine but a forbidden trust in an arm of flesh? Nevertheless, says Mr. Newman again, in reference to the Catholic Church: "Satan could not hinder, he could but *corrupt the kingdom promised to the saints.* He could but seduce them to *trust in an arm of flesh.* He could but sow the seeds of decay among them, by alluring them to bow down to 'Ashtareth the goddess of the Zidonians, and Milcom the abomination of the Ammonites,' (!) and to make a king over them 'like the nations when the Lord was their king.' Had it not been for this falling away in divers times and places, surely *Christendom* (does he by this mean the Church?) would not be in its present *miserable state of disunion* and weakness." (!)—*Newman's Sermons*, vol. 2, p. 282.

one, to be acknowledged *de fide*, in this professedly essential article of the Christian religion. On the other hand, the doctrine of the Roman Church, on this point, as on all others, is essentially *one*. But this unity which is formed into one nature, St. Clement of Alexandria says, "it is the endeavor of heresy to sever into many. Therefore, we say, that the Ancient and Catholic Church alone is one in essence, in opinion, in origin, and in excellence, one in faith."* With all the attempts, therefore, that have hitherto been made by Protestantism to reconcile either the opinions of individuals, or the systems of its different schools on this matter, there is still a most striking want of harmony, or rather an utter disagreement in their specifications of *these two*, so called righteousnesses. Hooker, as we have seen, in his early days, limited one of them to justification alone, and the other to sanctification alone; but, in his maturer age, when he acquired, according to Mr. Keeble, that *independence* of mind which he is said to discover in his Ecclesiastical Polity, he maintained *the two together* for justification, and which, he there says, is effected, *partly*, by imputation, and, *partly*, by infusion. And although there may be some approximation in this to the Oxford "unity" of our being saved both by Christ's righteousness and *our own together*, still we think it impossible to reconcile their respective definitions of what they term the two formal causes of our justification.

It will be remembered, also, that while Bishop Andrews, for example, insists upon two, they are not the two kinds which appear to be held either by Hooker, or by Archbishop Usher. Bishop Andrews, moreover, is called in the Oxford Tracts, "one of our wisest doctors and rulers."† This divine divides them, as we have seen, into "a righteousness accounted," and "a righteousness done;" the one being, according to him, an *abstract* principle, and the other, if we may borrow the language of Bishop Hopkins, "a *physical righteousness*."

Let us inquire, then, whether that, for example, which is called, by Bishop Andrews, "a righteousness done,"

* Strom. L. vii. n. 17, pp. 899, 900.
† Tract No. 71, p. 26.

be the same, for example, as the one which Archbishop Usher calls "the perfect obedience that Christ, in our nature, performed unto the whole law of God," and which by others is termed, "his external and finished obedience." Now this, it would appear, is not the case, since Andrews calls it an imperfect, and Usher a perfect one. Besides, Bishop Andrews maintains only one perfect righteousness, and this, with him, is the only one which he considers to be *accounted*, while his "righteousness *done*" is an imperfect one, and not accounted. *Both* of these, however, he declares to be *ours*.

Usher, moreover, maintains *three* distinct righteousnesses of Jesus Christ; viz.: 1st. "The essential righteousness of his divine nature," which he says is not accounted to us; 2d. The *absolute* integrity of our human nature in Christ;" and 3d. "The perfect obedience which he rendered to the law." Of these, *the two last only* are, with him, accounted to us. Thus, in Usher's "Body of Divinity," there are no less than *three perfect* righteousnesses, besides the *imperfect one*, which he holds with all the English divines.

According to the Tridentine doctrine, however, Christian righteousness, or the "formalis causa" of man's justification, is essentially one, and, as St. Cyprian says of the Church, is "widely extended by its fecundity: as there are many rays of light, but one sun;..... many streams of water, but one source. Take a ray from the sun; the unity of light allows not division;..... cut off the stream from its source; the stream dries up. So the Church sends forth her rays over the whole earth; yet is the light *one*, and its unity is *undivided*.*

But, perhaps, the difficulty referred to above, may be explained by classing the one which Andrews denominates "our righteousness in the abstract and not in the concrete," with the two imputed kinds of Usher; and the "imperfect" "righteousness done" of the former, with the imperfect and inherent one of the latter. Still, however, this classification would leave the remaining fourth, viz. "the essential one" of Usher, altogether out of the system of Andrews, which might possibly be

* De Unitate Ecclesiæ, p. 195.

classed with what the latter calls "abstract," were it not that this is already disposed of by him as the *sole accounted one*, on his own declared principle of *juridical* imputation.

Such, then, are some, only, of the inconsistencies of "the doctrine of two righteousnesses, perfect and imperfect," as held by English divines of the highest repute in their establishment, and as professed also in the school of the Oxford writers. The two, as held by the latter, are made, as we have seen, to consist of "Christ's imputed righteousness," and of "our own inchoate righteousness;" while the former only is defined to be perfect, and the latter "imperfect."

Since these cannot, then, be classified with the four, as held and defined by Usher, it would seem that they are intended to correspond with the two of Andrews; viz. "our righteousness in the abstract," on the one hand, and "our righteousness done," on the other. Certain it is, that the Oxford writers disclaim the two kinds as held by Hooker in his early days, and whose judgment on this point, Mr. Newman says, was not fully matured when he wrote his "valuable treatise" on justification.

Mr. Keeble, also, another divine of the Oxford school, in his edition of Hooker's works, says, that his "compositions upon this subject are mostly of an early date, when he hardly seems to have acquired that *independence of thought* which appears in the Polity." By referring, however, to our former extracts on this subject, from the same work, it will be seen that Hooker there maintains, that we are saved *partly* by the imputed justice of Jesus Christ, and *partly* by "habitual and real infusion,"* which latter is, by Mr. Newman, defined to be "our own inchoate righteousness," and in which *two*, he says, "I conceive to lie the *unity* of the *catholic* doctrine," being "the middle way," which, according to him, is neither the Roman nor the Protestant, but, as we have already shown, is in reality nothing more than one of the manifold varieties of the melancholy and unhappy reformation. But, as to the actual existence of a *Middle Way* in relation to the revealed dogmas of Christianity, the very as-

* Hooker's Eccle. Polity, l. v. § 56.

sumption of the position carries with it the sentence of its own condemnation. "There is," however, as St. Epiphanius says, "a *royal way*, which is the church of God, and the road of truth.—(*ὁδοιποῤια της ἀληθειας.*)—But each of these heresies, deserting that royal way, turning to the right or to the left, and trusting to error, is carried away, so as to keep within no bounds. Therefore, ye servants of God, and children of the church, who follow a sure Rule of Faith, and walk in the way of truth, take care that you be not deceived by the inconsistent discourses of erring sects."*

Upon the whole, then, this doctrine of the Oxford school evidently cannot be made to consist in any thing more or less than a visionary imputation to us of the absolute justice of God, as maintained by Hooker, coupled with an equally fallacious endeavor to blend it with an "inchoate righteousness" of "*our own.*" For it cannot be denied that, although Hooker in his treatise on justification once "plainly severed," upon the alleged authority of "St. Paul," the things which he vainly tries in his "Polity" to join together again in *a unity of his own*, he does this by making it to consist, as he says, partly in imputation and partly in real infusion.†

But this double, or two-fold doctrine of Christian salvation, which is the boasted fruit and glory of the so-called Reformation, is now most strangely upheld by the Oxford school under the profession and name of *Catholic* (*!*) unity. In vain, however, as St. Augustine says, will any class of men on earth appropriate to themselves this consecrated name—save only its rightful and commissioned owner. "Among the many considerations," he remarks, "that bind me to the Church, is the name of Catholic, which, not without reason, in the midst of so many heresies, this Church alone has so retained, that, although all heretics wish to acquire the name, should a stranger ask where the Catholics assemble, the heretics themselves will not dare to point out any of their own places of meeting."‡ And we have seen, moreover, how strikingly

* Hær. xxxix. Tome 1, p. 504. Edit. Coloniæ, 1682.
† Eccle. Polity, § 56.
‡ Contra Ep. Fundam, c. iv. Tome viii. p. 153.

this claim, in the cases we have noticed, may be traced in all its workings and ramifications of error, to a self-assumed and independent principle of man's own device, under the high-sounding name and title of *juridical and forensic imputation.*

Let this double system, therefore, of "the two righteousnesses, perfect and imperfect,"* come to us in what shape it may, whether under the symbols of reformed Christianity, so called, or *in the name of Catholic unity*, or even in the form of an angel of light, it is still a new and another gospel; being the very opposite of that catholic faith and truth which was once miraculously delivered to the saints and fathers of the ancient Church in the unity of its apostolic and vicarious head, and in whose divinely delegated custody it must ever remain, until the things which are seen and temporal, shall give place to those which are unseen and eternal.

In vain, then, shall we seek this living body on the earth, unless we resort, in the language of St. Cyprian, "to the Chair of Peter and to the principal Church, *whence the sacerdotal unity took its rise.*"† "To this Church," also, says St. Irenæus, "on account of its superior headship, every other must have recourse, ... and in which has been preserved the doctrine delivered by the Apostles."‡ We conclude, therefore, in opposition to all this imaginary imputation of the modern schools, that, as there is but one Christ, so is there but one Christian justice only in which man can share: one catholic doctrine only of salvation, and but *one true* scriptural and apostolic imputation of the merits of the blessed atonement. It is our duty, then, to hold to no other religion, as St. Augustine says, but that "which is Catholic, and is so called, (and so accounted,) not by us only, but by all its adversaries. For whether they be so disposed or not, in conversing with others, they *must* use the word Catholic, or they will not be understood."§

But should the Oxford Divines deny that it is *not* the

* Newman's Lectures, p. 420.

† Ad Petri Cathedram, atque ad Ecclesiam principalem, unde *unitas sacerdotalis* exorta est.—(*Ep.* iv. p. 86.)

‡ Ads. Hær. L. iii. c. 3, p. 175.

§ De vera Religione, c. vii. Tome i. p. 752.

essential justice of our Lord which they impute, then must they deny an imputation of the justice by which we are sanctified and accepted. The alternative is inevitable. From several of their expressions, therefore, it would sometimes appear, that, seeing before them the horns of this fatal dilemma, they incline to another extremity not less monstrous and revolting—even to a denial of imputation itself. This, however, it must be acknowledged is not done, and we do not at all suppose they would seriously sanction so rash a position. Indeed, it is too obvious, in this case, that the last error would be even worse than the first. For what would they gain by the hazards of such a course? Would they not, then, be obliged to acknowledge that the infused justice of Christ was not truly reputed by him, when given to his justified members? And would they not, by such a course, be compelled to admit the profane contradiction that God reputes it otherwise than he says, or, in other words, actually accounts it to be their justice, while, in reality, he neither speaks nor means the truth of his solemn declaration?

This course, however, as we before remarked, is by no means adopted, while they are satisfied with declaring in favor only of a *partial* imputation of Christ's justice, and, likewise, of the partial infusion of *another* which they call "our own." But, in the adoption of their so-called *Via Media*, they make it to differ from the Roman faith by repeating the ordinary calumny of Protestantism against the Church, in affirming that she actually denies to man an imputation of the justifying merits of Christ.

To this charge, then, we will simply reply by saying, that the imputation to the justified man of the justice of Jesus Christ, is no less acknowledged by the Tridentine Synod than is the faith itself of Jesus Christ. The expressions, themselves, so far from being objected to, are shown to us by the Council, that when lawfully used in the sense and interpretation of the Church, they are most truly sanctified by God, and consecrated to his service. But what the Church strictly forbids and condemns, is their new or modern signification, as applied to her ancient and immutable traditions. Is it not evident, then, that the expressions themselves are not the object of her

condemnation, but simply their unlawful connection with others in a spurious exposition of her holy truth? The anathema of the Council, therefore, be it remembered, is *not* against the imputation of the justice of God to man, but against the errors and pernicious consequences of the "*sola* imputatio," and the "*sola* fides" of the Protestant reform.

Were we, indeed, to deny that the justice of God in Christ is not verily and formally accounted to us for our justification in his sight, because the Church teaches that this justice is also infused, it is plain that it would be not only a virtual denial of the decrees and canons of her Œcumenical councils, but an entire abandonment of the very argument at issue, on justifying grace, between her and those adversaries by whom she is so unreasonably accused. On the other hand, we are aware that many Protestant writers, who have attended to the merits of the controversy, are free to acknowledge that the anathema of the Council is no more against imputation or imputed justice than it is against faith itself, and that her decrees are levelled only against that imputation, and that imputed justice, and that imputed faith, as these things are held and advocated by the Reformers, and conformably to the sense of Protestant interpretation. For, if we say that the justice of God in Christ is *not* imputed to us, we might, with the same reason, argue that his faith is not imputed; and, consequently, if neither his justice, nor his faith, nor his grace, are accounted or imputed to us as *our* gifts, (i. e. from him,) they certainly could not be truly called, or justly named, *our* merits. But, as is said in the Council of Trent, the bounty of the Lord is so great towards all men, that he will have those gifts, which he bestows upon them, to be their merits; and, consequently, the gift of his justice, which he infuses in us, he also wills and accounts to be ours. But since the Protestant system imputes only the essential justice of God, its advocates refuse to account to us even the works of charity as *our* merits. Of the former, therefore, according to their own acknowledgment, they make only an imaginary or figurative imputation, and, of course, condemn the merit of the latter, because they unjustly account them as our own proper deeds; but which last,

be it ever remembered, are counted by Catholics, as merely the fruitless or unprofitable "works of the law." As the Church, however, adopts the saying of St. Austin, "That God crowns his own gifts when he crowns our merits,"* so, when God infuses and bestows his justice upon her living members, she, accordingly, regards the same as ours; not, indeed, by a legal or visionary imputation, but by an imputation of the Word himself, in spirit and in truth. His justice, therefore, though not properly our own, as in a natural sense, is nevertheless ours in unity with Him, by whom, and through whom, and in whom, we participate, and merit, and possess. Protestant controvertists, therefore, and particularly the English divines we have cited, being well aware that the dogma of the Roman Church is not against the imputation to us of our Lord's justice, but simply against their own mere and outward imputation of it, are careful to confine their arguments against the Catholic doctrine, on the special ground that it teaches an imputation to us of infused and inherent justice. In so doing, also, they professedly make an *essential* distinction between Christian justice and living faith; and, at the same time declare, that, while the latter may be infused, the former is only and merely accounted. Thus do they deny that the very justice which was merited for us by Christ, as the only formal cause of our justification, can ever be imputed to us, save only in the bare and outward manner of their own private and unauthorized interpretations.

On the other hand, the Church of Rome holds and teaches in regard to both, or either, that they are not only truly and justly accounted to us, but that they are, at the same time, really and actually infused. And therefore it is, that, according to her, the renewed man is not only reputed and named just, but is so made and formed,

* Bossuet informs us that one of the Protestant synods on the continent, in order to condemn the merit of good works, quotes this saying of St. Austin, (so frequently repeated by him,) in such a manner as to make him say, "He crowns in us, not our merits, but his own gifts."(!!)—*Synt. Gen.*, part i. p. 26. The difference of these two modes of speaking, is easily perceived. The one unites the merits with the gifts, while the other, agreeably to the dividing principle of Hooker, "severs the one from the other."(!)

through the Holy Spirit, by a justice which is given to him only from the Lord. But the system of the English divines, as we have seen, also acknowledges a distinction between Christian justice and Christian sanctity, in such a manner, that while they maintain the latter only to be infused, they at the same time teach that the former is but merely accounted, and not infused; and with this reasoning, they charge the Roman Church, that, because she holds it to be infused, therefore, it is not by her actually and truly so accounted!

Now, the Church of Rome, which is justly called Catholic, "because," as St. Cyril says, "she teaches catholically, and without any omission,"* while she invariably distinguishes between "*fides viva*," (living faith,) and "*fides sola*," (faith alone,) so, in like manner, does she distinguish between that "*sola imputatio*," (imputation alone,) which proceeds from the invention of man, and that Catholic and infallible imputation, which is based upon "the pillar and ground of the Truth."

So do we also find the learned St. Thomas Aquinas to reason against those who deny there is faith in the evil spirits. On the contrary, he tells his opponents that they have faith, as is shown by St. James, when he says that the devils believe and tremble. Nevertheless, he adds, that such, being but faith alone, is dead,—a faith which is in name only, but without life or charity, and, therefore, is not the saving faith of the justified Christian. The former, he says, being but a mere act or habit of the intellect, and considered only in that light, is the same as the mere exercise of a Christian man's understanding; but, as it is not united to grace, it is not, of course, in that sense, the justice or the justifying gift of a quickened and renovated creature in the Lord.

But, since *Protestant* imputation is professedly maintained by its advocates to be an imputation to us of that

* "The Church is called Catholic, because it teaches catholically, and without any omission, all points that men should know, concerning things visible and invisible, heavenly and earthly."—*Cat.* xviii. n. 23, p. 296. "Guard the faith, and that faith alone, which is now delivered to thee by the Church, confirmed as it is by all the Scriptures."—*St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Cat.* v. n. 12, p. 77.

Almighty justice which cannot be made inherent in the creature, it consequently comes under the holy ban of the "*sola* imputatio" of the canon of Trent, which is evidently directed as well against a system which would ascribe to man a justice which belongs to the Infinite One alone, as against a no less visionary justification of our fallen nature by a self-righteousness of the law.

Nevertheless, it is evident, that one may be truly named and truly accounted a Christian—a Catholic Christian*—while, at the same time, he cannot be truly accounted a living member of Christ, except he be a justified man; not, indeed, as Tyndale and his followers would argue, "before the world only," but, as the Church herself teaches, in the sight of the Lord, "who knoweth the heart." For it is one thing to "detain the truth of God in injustice," κατέχειν τὴν αλήθειαν ἐν αδικια, and another thing to hold it in the bond of charity; in like manner, it is also clear that men may even speak the faith in truth, whilst they may not, at the same time, speak it in the spirit of Christian meekness, or of Christian love. The imputation, therefore, to fallen man of a justification before his God by a "sola fides," or a "sola justitia," in severance from the infused grace and charity of the Catholic Church, is most righteously sealed with the anathema of her authoritative councils.

We ask, moreover, if it is not evident, that if imputation be nothing else than a name, it can no more save us than the mere name of faith. For an imputation which accounts to us what belongs to God alone, is, not only an empty, but an illusive sound, "signifying nothing," a—"vox et preterea nihil."† And when Mr.

* Si quis dixerit, amissa per peccatum gratia, simul et fidem semper amitti; aut fidem, quæ remanet, non esse veram fidem, licet non sit viva; aut eum qui *fidem sine charitate habet, non esse Christianum;* anathema sit.

† Archbishop Usher, indeed, expressly avows our justifying faith to be nothing else, according to the English creed, than the mere act of the creature, considered only as a *barren* instrument. Still, he contends exclusively for *the name*, and declares that God has given this "a name above all names." (!)

Bishop Onderdonk, of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Pennsylvania, in a charge to the clergy of his diocese, in like manner, maintains that our most holy faith, "in its highest and best sense,"

Newman says, in reference to his own "doctrine of two righteousnesses," that, in these two, "*he conceives* the Catholic unity to lie," what is this but a name, only, of catholicity, most sadly perverted to the teaching of error, in connection with terms that make it a mockery only of true and legitimate reasoning?

But while we repudiate, with the Councils of the Catholic Church, a mere, or outward imputation of the justice of Christ, God forbid that we should embrace the opposite error, of denying that the merit of his justice, or obedience, is not truly imputed to us, whenever, and as often as its grace and charity are actually infused in our hearts.* According to the Protestant doctrine, and as we have seen to be held in the English Church, an imputed justice of Christ is ascribed to man, as contra-distinguished from an infused one. They maintain that his justice is accounted, and *not infused*. But the Catholic Church, who holds that the unity of his sanctifying

is but mere opinion, founded on the fallible testimony of man.—"The only choice," he says, "of all who have not seen, is between opinions."

"Doth this," he asks, "offend you, Christian? Are you *surprised* to hear that your faith *is but opinion, though in its best sense?* Reflect, what *more* would you have? Will you not believe, 'except you see signs and wonders?' Yet without seeing these, and testing them, you *cannot* have a *truly infallible knowledge* of your religion; and without such an infallible knowledge, you *cannot* have *any other faith* than that of (mere) opinion, or a seriously formed judgment. Do you prefer to *this*, the infallibility of the Romanist?" He concludes his charge with the following appeal: "Is this solemn, deliberate, responsible opinion, (i. e. of mere fallible man,) based on *such* moral certainty, (i. e. which may or may not be true,) unworthy to be called faith? Perish the unjust cavil."(!)—*The Rule of Faith; a Charge to the Clergy, by the Rt. Rev. H. V. Onderdonk, D. D., &c.*, p. 41, 42. *Published by the N. Y. Prot. Epis. Tract Society.*

To this we will only say, that, may God grant our Protestant friends to perceive the emptiness of such a faith; and, above all, to place their reliance upon the infallible teaching of his Holy Spirit, through the only incorruptible organ and interpreter of his living and written Word.

* And yet Mr. Newman, who advocates a *partial* imputation to us of Christ's obedience, as the characteristic of his school, most incorrectly informs his readers, that the Church of Rome denies imputation altogether, and teaches "that obedience justifies *without* a continual imputation of Christ's merits."(!)—*Lecture on Justification*, p. 420.

justice is undivided and indivisible, maintains that, whenever it is applied to us, it is accounted as well as infused, and, moreover, that it is never truly accounted,—save only when it is infused. For she, indeed, admits of no "imputation alone," no "justice alone," as the properties of justified men, according to the unity of her living and regenerating faith.

While the adversaries, therefore, of the Catholic Church reproach her with a denial of the imputed justice of Jesus Christ, God forbid that her members, through the occasion of an unlawful use, by the former, of the consecrated term, should ever retort by an acknowledgment of its denial. The abuse of the expression itself, it is plain, is no more an argument against its legitimate use, than the abuse of any dogma of the faith, or of any sacrament of the Church, would be a justifiable plea, either against their truth or their intrinsic efficacy, or even against the authority of the Church herself. "Then," says Eusebius, "are Christ's garments divided, and lots cast for his coat, when each one corrupts and tears (or abuses) the beauty of his Word, that is, *the expressions* of the Holy Scriptures, and entertains such opinions as are usually advanced by heretics."*

There is not, moreover, a single expression employed by the Councils of the Church, in her explanation of the dogmas of our faith, which, if admitted in its mere natural, popular, or carnal sense, would not effectively destroy the beauty and the proportions of the whole. No sooner, then, had the modern Babel of Reform, with her boasted rule of private interpretation, been erected in the room of the ancient Catholic Church, than the venerable landmarks and definitions of her faith were, also, swept away in the same tide of ruthless ignorance and unsparing desolation. The most strange, wild, and monstrous theories of every kind, were taught by all ranks and classes of men.† It was then that the imputed justice of our

* Demon. Evan. L. x. p. 506. Paris, 1628.

† Dr. Southey remarks, that "many of the inferior preachers were for hurrying forward to destroy, rather than to reform. *The Bible itself gave occasion for evil;* presumptuous and ignorant persons no sooner read, than they took upon themselves to expound it; they interrupted the church-service by thus holding forth; dis-

Redeemer first received an interpretation which mocked the hallowed Councils of the Church, and defied the wisdom of her conservative definitions. Men, not content with denying the possibility of all justifying merit in man, proceeded to condemn the expression itself, as an infringement of the Church upon the personal and proper merits of our Redeemer; until, at length, they ventured to impute to the creature himself, not the justice of Jesus Christ, wherewith, according to the distinctions of the Catholic Church, we are renewed and sanctified, but even that absolute and incommunicable justice of the Infinite One, by which he is just in himself alone.*

cussed points of Scripture in ale-houses and taverns; quarrelled over them, and bandied about the reproachful appellations of papist and heretic. Those insane opinions also were abroad which struck at the root of all authority, civil or ecclesiastical, and of all social order."

"The bricklay'r throws his trowel by,
And now builds mansions in the sky;
The cobbler, touch'd with holy pride,
Flings his old shoes and last aside,
And now devoutly sets about
Cobbling souls that ne'er wear out.
The baker now a preacher grown,
Finds man lives not by bread alone,
And now his customers he feeds
With prayers, with sermons, groans, and creeds.
The tinman, moved by wrath within,
Hammers the gospel just like tin;
Weavers inspired, their shuttles leave,
Sermons and flimsy hymns to weave;
Barbers unreap'd will leave the chin,
To trim and shave the man within;
The waterman forgets his wherry,
And opens a celestial ferry;
The brewer, bit by frenzy's grub,
The mashing for the preaching tub
Resigns, those waters to explore,
Which if you drink, you thirst no more;
The gard'ner, weary of his trade,
Tir'd of the mattock and the spade,
Chang'd to Apollo in a trice,
Waters the plants of Paradise;
The fishermen no longer set
For fish the meshes of their net,
But catch, like Peter, men of sin,
For catching is to take them in."

* "The fact is," says Dr. Milner, "that this method of deter-

We have seen, moreover, that in order to sustain the plausibility, and uphold the consistency of their unwarranted and self-imputed theories, they have even presumed, after his adversaries of old, to account the holy and immaculate Victim of Calvary *as a trangressor and a sinner!* Him, indeed! who was, emphatically, The Just One—the only just and infallible one under its sentence—who, for our sakes, bore in himself its fullest curse and anger, even to death itself, in order that his creatures, being ransomed from the bondage of their guilt, and the pains of its eternal punishment, might, with his grace, freely serve him to the end of their lives, in true justice and acceptable obedience.

Their imaginary imputation, also, of the proper attribute of the Godhead, as the only formal and justifying grace of the creature, was embraced by *all* the sects, as the distinctive excellence of the glorious reform; while, at the same time, the purchased merit of the Cross, which, by the justice of God, is infused in all the living members of his body, was strenuously denied and rejected, as a corrupted and self-inherent righteousness of the Roman Hierarchy.*

mining religious questions by *Scripture only*, according to each individual's interpretation, whenever and wherever it has been adopted, has always produced endless and incurable dissensions, and, of course, errors; because truth is one, while errors are numberless. The ancient fathers of the Church reproached the sects of heretics and schismatics with their endless internal divisions; 'See,' says St. Augustine, 'into how many morsels those are divided, who have divided themselves from the unity of the Church!' Another father writes, 'It is natural for error to be ever changing. The disciples have the same right in this matter that their masters had.'"—*Milner's End of Controversy*, p. 34.

* We take this opportunity of inserting the following testimony, from a distinguished literary periodical, in behalf of the peculiar excellence of our divinely organized and supernatural Establishment. Our Catholic readers need not to be reminded of the want of accuracy in some of the expressions, as applied to the Church, and especially where there would seem to imply that it was an extraordinary institution of man, and not a living work of the Eternal One himself.

Says an eloquent writer, in a late number of the Edinburgh Review, "There is not, and there never was on this earth, a work of human policy so well deserving of examination as the Roman Catholic Church. The history of that Church joins together the two great ages of human civilization. No other institution is left

Thus was the payment of the penalty which fallen man owed to the violated law, and which was discharged by the Son of Man alone, that which was the exclusive and incommunicable glory of the second person of the Triune God—which none but Almighty and uncreated power alone could obtain—accounted to the persons of weak and fallen creatures ; while the living justice, also, which he purchased by this tremendous sacrifice, as a gift to his renewed followers, was also accounted, by this same system of modern interpretation, as the self-

standing which carries the mind back to the times when the smoke of sacrifice rose from the Pantheon, and when tame leopards and tigers bounded in the Flavian amphitheatre. The proudest royal houses are but yesterday, when compared with the line of the Supreme Pontiffs. That line we trace back in an unbroken series, from the Pope who crowned Napoleon, in the nineteenth century, to the Pope who crowned Pepin in the eighth ; and far beyond the time of Pepin, the august dynasty extends, till it is lost in the twilight of fable. The republic of Venice came next in antiquity. But the republic of Venice was modern, when compared with the papacy ; and the republic of Venice is gone, and the papacy remains. The papacy remains, not in decay, not a mere antique ; but full of life and youthful vigor. The Catholic Church is still sending forth, to the farthest ends of the world, missionaries as zealous as those who landed in Kent with Augustine ; and still confronting hostile kings with the same spirit with which she confronted Attila. The number of her children is greater than in any former age. Her acquisitions in the new world have more than compensated her for what she has lost in the old. Her spiritual ascendency extends over the vast countries which lie between the plains of the Missouri and Cape Horn—countries which, a century hence, may not improbably contain a population as large as that which now inhabits Europe. The members of her communion are certainly not fewer than a hundred and fifty millions, and it will be difficult to show that all the other Christian sects united, amount to more than a hundred and twenty millions. Nor do we see any sign which indicates that the term of her long dominion is approaching. She saw the commencement of all the governments, and of all the ecclesiastical establishments that now exist in the world ; and we feel no assurance that she is not destined to see the end of them all. She was great and respected before the Saxon had set foot on Britain—before the Frank had passed the Rhine—when Grecian eloquence still flourished at Antioch—when idols were still worshipped in the temple of Mecca. And she may still exist in undiminished vigor when some traveller from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London bridge, to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's."

righteousness of the law, and the chief mystery and abomination of the Man of Sin.*

It was, then, by this new, and before unheard-of *interpretation* of imputed justice by the Reformers, that they rejected the unity of the Catholic faith, and rent the seamless garment of our Lord; not, indeed, by denying the divine authority of the inspired expressions, or the inspiration of Holy Writ, but by a perversion and wresting of the sacred meaning, in departing from the venerable rule of ancient and apostolic guidance. While they still professed their adherence to the written oracles, they refused to receive the sacred definitions of their authorized interpreter, and judge, and keeper. In the room of her living tradition and authority, they substituted their own unbridled interpretation, notwithstanding the written admonition, that no Scripture is of private interpretation, and arrogantly taught the sufficiency of the Bible alone. Thus they made the inspired volume itself, nay, the very words of its consecrated text, with all its divinely appropriated phraseology, the most fruitful occasion of subverting its time-honored doctrines, and wresting its most holy truth and meaning to their own destruction.†

* "At one time," says Bossuet, "it was held that faith was founded on Scripture alone; but, now, they form it without Scripture, and only according to their own feelings and preconceived sentiments." "This testimony," he continues, "imagined by men to proceed from the Holy Ghost, whereby to discern divine Scripture from Scripture not divine, was held deservedly for fanaticism and *a means of deceit;* because this testimony, not being annexed to any positive proof, there was not a man that could not either boast of it without reason, or fancy it to himself without grounds. But the case is now much worse; whereas they said formerly, 'let us see what is written, and then we will believe,' which was beginning at least by something positive, and a certain fact: now, they begin by feeling things in themselves, as you feel cold and heat, sweet and bitter; and when afterwards they come to read the Scripture in this disposition, God knows with what facility they turn it to what they already hold, for as certain as what they have seen with their eyes, and touched with their hands."—*Hist. de Var.*, Vol. ii. Book xv. Sect. 116.

† "To speak now," says Dr. Milner, "of the Protestant reformers. No sooner had their progenitor, Martin Luther, set up the tribunal of his private judgment on the sense of Scripture, in opposition to the authority of the Church, ancient and modern, than his disciples, proceeding on his principle, undertook to prove,

"As long as words a *different sense will bear*,
And each may be his own interpreter,
Our airy faith will no foundation find:
The word's a weathercock for every wind."*

Thus, by their own unhappy and melancholy experience, did the Reformers demonstrate to the world, that the Book, with all its divine expressions, though good and holy in themselves, was not the method by which our Lord intended that mankind, in general, should be taught the lessons of his sacred truth.†

from plain texts of the Bible, that his own doctrine was erroneous, and that the Reformation itself wanted reforming. Carlostad, Zuinglius, Œcolampadius, Muncer, and a hundred more of his followers, wrote and preached against him, and against each other, with the utmost virulence, still each of them professing to ground his doctrine and conduct on the written word of God alone. In vain did Luther claim a superiority over them; in vain did he denounce hell-fire against them; in vain did he threaten to return back to the Catholic religion: he had put the Bible into each man's hand to explain it for himself: this his followers continued to do in open defiance of him; till their mutual contradictions and discords became so numerous and scandalous, as to overwhelm the thinking part of them with grief and confusion."—*Milner's End of Controversy*, p. 35.

* Dryden's Hind and Panther, Part 1.

† "If Christ," says Dr. Milner, "had intended that all mankind should learn his religion from *a book*, namely, *The New Testament*, he himself would have written that book, and would have laid down, as the first and fundamental precept of his religion, the obligation of learning to read it; whereas, he never wrote any thing at all, unless, perhaps, the sins of the Pharisees with his finger upon the dust. It does not even appear that he gave his Apostles any command to write the Gospels; though he repeatedly, and emphatically, commanded them to preach it, and that to all the nations of the earth. The ancient fathers tell us, that St. Matthew wrote his Gospel at the particular request of the Christians of Palestine, and that St. Mark composed his at the desire of those at Rome. St. Luke addressed his Gospel to an individual, Theophilus, having written it, says the holy evangelist, because *it seemed good to him to do so*. St. John wrote the last of the gospels in compliance with the petition of the clergy and people of Lesser Asia, to prove, in particular, the divinity of Jesus Christ, which Cerinthus, Ebion, and other heretics, began then to deny. The canonical Epistles in the New Testament, show the particular occasions on which they were written, and prove, as the Bishop of Lincoln observes, that 'they are not to be considered as regular treatises on the Christian religion.'"—*Milner's End of Controversy*, pp. 33, 34.

Now, if a Protestant should say that he believed in the real presence, but that he objected to the use of the expression, not because it could not be found in the Bible, but because it was used by the Church of Rome, what would be thought of his consistency, to say nothing of his charity, by Christians in general, whether of the one faith or of the other?

In like manner, if a Catholic should seriously object to the expression of the reputed justice of Christ, or, of its imputation to the justified man, not because it was not, in itself, correct and true, but because it was used by Protestants, and on account of the evil consequences they deduce from it, what, on similar grounds, would be thought of his consistency, or his reverence for the claims of truth, either by Christians in his own Church, or by those among the sects in general?

We merely present these cases before our readers, to exemplify the groundless nature of the reproaches we so often meet with in Protestant writers: that the *Catholic Church disclaims the imputed justice of our Redeemer* to the justified man; to show, also, that Catholics repel the charge, as a mere invention of their adversaries, and to convince the latter, that it is the ancient Church alone, which, under the pain of her holy anathema, has duly preserved and guarded in her authoritative definitions, as well the Truth itself, as the consecrated terms under which it is revealed.

"In a word," says Bossuet, "whatever the Lutheran doctrine has that is good, had not only been entire in the Church, but also had been much better explained, inasmuch as all false ideas were clearly removed from it. The truth of this assertion appears *principally* in the doctrine of *imputed justice*. The Lutherans imagined they had discovered something wonderful and peculiar to themselves, when they said, 'God *imputed to us the justice* of Jesus Christ, who had perfectly satisfied for us, *and rendered his merits ours*.' Yet the Scholastics, so much censured by them, were full of this doctrine. The Council of Trent did acknowledge, with sufficient fulness, 'that the merits of Jesus Christ, and of his passion,' were rendered ours by justification, since it repeats so often 'that by it they are communicated to us,

and without it none can be justified.' Luther, indeed, thus defines justifying faith :—' True faith is the work of God in us, by which we are renovated, and born again of God.' And this faith is that true justice which St. Paul calls the justice of God, and which God approves. By *this*, therefore," continues Bossuet, " we are both justified and regenerated at the same time, and since the Holy Ghost, that is, God himself acting in us, interposes in this work, it is no imputation *out of us*, as Protestants will *now* have it, but a work *within* us."

The patriarch of the Reformation, then, it would seem, did not even profess to sever the unity of Christian justice into *parts*, distinct from each other, as was afterwards done by the divines of the English Church, under the fallacious supposition that St. Paul had before done the same. Hooker, moreover, as we have before noticed, while he strenuously insists that " St. Paul doth plainly sever" the " one from the other," most gravely affirms that *his* Church has received this same teaching " by the hands of the Apostles." (!) Now, Luther, who did not even pretend to such a commission,* still professed a unity of Christian justice ; nevertheless, as this was a mere unity of his own, without charity and good works, or, in other words, a " fides *sola*," and a " justitia *sola*," it was afterwards judged expedient, in order to get rid of the monstrous, but necessary consequences of his tenet of " faith alone," to divide the principle into *two*

* For the doctrine which he taught was advocated by him on his own individual authority ; and whenever the Apostolic epistles did not accord with his own private views, he either altered the text, or else struck out the epistle altogether, as unworthy of a place in *his* canon. In vindication of his own doctrine of imputed justice, to the exclusion of good works, he vaunts as follows :— " This article shall remain in spite of all the world ; it is I, Martin Luther, evangelist, who says it ; let no one, therefore, attempt to infringe it : neither the Emperor of the Romans, nor of the Turks, nor of the Tartars ; neither the Pope, nor the monks, nor the nuns, nor the kings, nor the princes, nor all the devils in hell. If they attempt it, may the infernal flames be their recompense. *What I say here is to be taken for an inspiration of the Holy Ghost.*" (*!!*)—*Visit. Saxon.* Still, however, on this single subject, " there are," says his disciple, Osiander, " twenty different opinions, *all drawn from the Scripture*, and held by members of the Augsburg or Lutheran Confession."—*Archdeacon Blackburn's Confessional*, p. 16.

parts! and then to teach it in such a manner, as to say, *that we are saved partly by the one, and partly by the other!*

The doctrine, moreover, of Protestant justification, according to the teaching of all the English divines we have cited, with the exception only of the Oxford school, expressly maintains that the renewed justice of man consists in nothing more than a mere outward imputation, and that it is not, according to them, an intrinsic justice wherewith we are sanctified. Accordingly, as it is only the absolute or essential justice of our Lord's divinity which they maintain for their imputation, it must of necessity be no other than a fictitious imputation of man's own devising, and directly at variance with the Catholic imputation of St. Paul, or the same apostolic and consecrated imputation of the Church of Rome.

The difference, also, it is to be remarked, between Protestant and Catholic imputation, is even greater than it appears to be. For the Catholic to understand the doctrine of Protestant imputation, it is necessary for him to know that the sense of the language, in which it is conveyed, is altogether different from what the former is accustomed to annex to the same terms. And, although on this account, there may, at first, *appear* to be an approximation between them on this point, by reason that the terms of each are the words of Holy Scripture, yet nothing, it is to be noted, can be more at variance than the meaning in which they are respectively viewed. For the justice of Jesus Christ is a sanctifying, as well as an accounted justice, and the mouth of his holy Church hath spoken forth its excellence to the ends of the earth, that every other "mouth may be stopped, and all the world be made subject to God; because by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight."* In her infallible definitions, she speaks with an accuracy which admits of no defect. In her mouth they are the two-edged sword of the Spirit proceeding from the Word of the Lord, like the flaming sword in Paradise, turning in every direction to guard the royal highway of the Tree of Life.

If an inquirer, therefore, after truth, sigh for a deliv-

* Rom. iii. 19, 20.

ery from the confusion of voices and contradiction of tongues, he may be certain of finding it in the unwavering and faultless interpretation of her œcumenical councils. For in these alone does truth shine forth on the earth without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing ; but, as it should be, holy and without blemish. To the sincere inquirer, therefore, in search of the infallible doctrine of Jesus Christ, we confidently say, in the words of the learned and distinguished Bishop of Hippo: "Do thou run to the tabernacle of God ; hold fast to the Catholic Church ; do not depart from the rule of truth,* and thou shalt be protected in the tabernacle from the contradiction† of tongues."‡

It is granted, on all hands, that there is no place in Scripture where it is expressly stated, in so many words, that the justice of Christ is imputed to the justified man. It is said, however, in Rom. iv., that the faith of Abraham was reputed§ to him unto justice, or, in other lan-

* Ecclesiam Catholicam tene ; a regula veritatis noli discedere.

† We insert here, as a specimen of this "contradiction of tongues," out of the pale of the Catholic Church, the following statements :—

Capito, minister of Strasburg, writing to Farel, pastor of Geneva, thus complains to Luther : "God has given me to understand the mischief we have done, by our precipitancy in breaking with the Pope, &c. The people say to us, I know enough of the gospel : I can read it for myself. I have no need of you."—(*Inter. Epist. Calvini.*) In the same tone, Dudith writes to his friend Beza, "Our people are carried away with every wind of doctrine. If you know what their religion is to-day, you cannot tell what it will be to-morrow. In what single point are those churches which have declared war against the Pope agreed among themselves ? There is not one point which is not held by some of them as an article of faith, and by others as an impiety." In the same sentiment, Calvin, writing to Melancton, says, "It is of great importance that the divisions which subsist among us, should not be known to future ages ; for nothing can be more ridiculous than that we, who have broken off from the whole world, should have agreed so ill among ourselves, from the very beginning of the reformation."—*See Milner's End of Controversy*, p. 36.

‡ St. Augus. Enar. iv. in Psal. xxx. T. iv. p. 166.

§ "*Reputed, &c.*, i. e. by God, who *reputeth* nothing otherwise than it is. However, we may gather from this word, that when we are justified, our justification proceedeth from God's free grace and bounty ; and not from any efficacy which any act of ours could have of its own nature, abstracting from God's grace."—*Notes on Chap.* iv. *of Rom., Doway Bible.*

guage, accounted to him for justice: the sense being in no wise different, or, in fact, substantially the same. Does it, then, follow from this, as Calvin asserts, that because it is here said that the faith of Abraham was reputed unto justice, that, therefore, "faith alone" justifies, or, that the absolute justice of Christ is accounted to his elect? God forbid! Can we, then, hesitate for an answer, when we know it is *not* said that the faith of Abraham was "faith alone," and when the divine gift in him cannot, of necessity, be any other than *living* faith itself; or, in the language of St. Augustine and St. Thomas, that *fides formata*, which is united with charity; and, therefore, the quickening and infused grace of God in Abraham, by which he was effectively justified before God, and which, St. Paul tells us, was accounted to him for his justice, as the father of all the faithful? It could not, therefore, it is evident, be the *sola justitia*, or the absolute and extrinsic justice of God, which was imputed to the ancient patriarch for his justice, since the latter was, of necessity, an infused or inherent principle and property communicated to this spiritual member and father of the household of faith.

"It is in this sense," says Bossuet, "that the Catholic Church had always confessed, after St. Paul, that 'Jesus Christ is made unto us wisdom,' not by simply imputing to us that wisdom which is in him, but by infusing into our souls that wisdom which flows from his; that he is 'unto us justice and sanctity,' in the same sense that he is redemption; not by covering our crimes only, but by defacing them entirely by his Holy Spirit poured into our hearts: moreover, that we are 'made the justice of God in Jesus Christ,' in a manner more intimate than Jesus Christ 'had been made to be sin for us, since God had made him sin;' to wit, the victim for sin, by treating him as a sinner though he were just; whereas he 'had made us the justice of God in him;' not by leaving us in our sins, and merely treating us as just men, but by taking from us our sins, and by rendering us just."—*Hist. des Var.*, Tome ii. L. xv. § 144.

We admit, therefore, with Calvin, that the faith of Abraham was truly the justice of God; but, at the same time, we also assert what Calvin denies: that this gift was, of necessity, a principle formed within him by the Holy Spirit, and could not, therefore, be a justice of God without him. The sacred text, therefore, so far from furnishing a proof in favor of the doctrine that "faith

alone" justifies, most plainly shows that the faith of the patriarch was *not* alone, or, in other words, a dead faith; but a principle of life and justice from God, formed and inherent in him, as an obedient servant of a gracious Lord. Were we, moreover, to reason from the text, agreeably to its words and logical import, it would certainly follow, inasmuch as the faith which was accounted to him, was no other than an acceptable and inherent principle of divine justice, that the same would be likewise imputed to all and every one who professed it, as the *only formal cause* of their justification before him with whom they had to do.

The system, also, of Calvin was, that this justice was accounted to Abraham only through the principle of faith, considered, according to his own assumption, as *a mere instrument* of believing. With such an unauthorized hypothesis, then he proceeds to argue, that we are merely reputed just, simply by apprehending the extrinsic justice of God, and in this, he concludes, consists the justification of man. On these self-assumed grounds, therefore, of Calvin, who denies that the living faith of Abraham was really accounted to him as the justice of God formed in him, it is plain that he could not have selected a text, from the whole volume of inspiration, more directly calculated to show the palpable contradiction, and utter vanity of his "most lame and impotent conclusion."

How the Almighty and essential justice of our Lord's divinity, can be formally imputed to us, in any way or sense whatever, is not only impossible to conceive, but is, in the highest degree, daring and presumptuous to assert. But that the merit and justice of his passion should be accounted ours, *when* we are formally renewed by its application, or inward efficacy, is no less easy to apprehend, than it is to perceive, that the former sentiment is absolutely inconceivable, and, at the same time, repugnant to reason and common sense.

Is it, then, we ask, in any degree more inconsistent or absurd to reason as Calvin does, and others after him, on the words of St. Paul, than it would be agreeably to the following supposed case? As, for instance, if one should argue that since we are said, according to St.

Paul, to be justified by faith, and also, according to St. James, that devils and some wicked men are said to have faith, and since both of these can quote Scripture to prove it in their way,—that, therefore, all men are justified, provided only they have this self-same faith!

As the faith, however, which justifies us in God's sight, is the gift of his grace and justice in our hearts, and as this is the only faith that can save us, being one in necessary connection with good works, and wrought in us by the Holy Spirit, it is, consequently, not alone or dead, but is effectively or truly imputed to us as our justice in Christ, and from whose Spirit it is diffused.

In regard to the connection of the term "imputed"* with that of "justice," we know that it occurs no less than seven times in a single chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. And although it is not there expressed that the faith of Abraham was the infused faith of God in this father of the faithful, where is the Catholic, we ask, who has ever denied, that this was substantially the grace and justice of God in him,—of God who accounts the same to every child born of him, and who reputes nothing to his children otherwise than it really is in spirit and in truth?

"In order," says Bossuet, "to make this grace inherent in us absolutely gratuitous, our forefathers did not believe that it was necessary to say, one cannot dispose himself for them by good desires, nor obtain them by prayers; but they believed these good desires and prayers were themselves inspired of God; and this is what the Council of Trent has done, after their example, when it said, that all our good dispositions came 'from a preventing grace;' that we could not 'dispose and prepare ourselves for grace, but as we are 'excited and assisted by grace itself;' that God is the source of all justice, and in this quality ought to be beloved; and that there was 'no believing, hoping, loving, nor repenting as we ought, so that the grace of justification might be conferred upon us, without a preventing inspiration of the Holy Ghost.' Wherein this holy Council has done no more than repeat what we read in the Council of Orange, viz.: 'that we can neither will, nor believe, nor think, nor love, as we ought to do, and advantageously, but by the inspiration of preventing grace;' that is to say, they would not dispute either against heretics, or against infidels, or even against heathens, or, in a word, against any others who imag-

* For whether we use the English words "repute," or "account," or "reckon," or "impute," they all correspond, in substance, to the Latin "*reputo*," or the Greek "Λογιζομαι."

ine they love God, and who feel in effect inclinations so like to those of the faithful ; but, without entering with them into an impossible discussion of the precise differences of their sentiments from those of the just, they were satisfied with defining, that what is performed without grace, is not 'as it ought to be,' nor agreeable to God, since 'without faith it is impossible to please him.' "*

Let it be remembered, also, that the Catholic Church, while she accounts the living faith of Abraham as the justice of God in him, the spiritual forefather of many nations, she also accounts it to be the same faith in every justified heir of Abraham, "according to the promise," and through his "seed, who is Christ." In like manner, as the great champion of orthodoxy, in the western Church, against the heresy of Arius, speaks of the unity of the Church, so may we also speak of its universal faith ; for though it be one, every living member has the same faith. "It is one in all : una in omnibus est ;"† for, although there are many members, the faith is one among them all. And, again, in his work on the Trinity, we find him speaking of the Church as follows : "As their mind and heart were one, I ask, did this arise from unity of belief? Truly. Again I ask : is faith necessarily one? It is. Utrum fides una, *anne altera sit?* Una certe. The Apostle teaching (Ephes. ix.) one faith, one Lord, one baptism, one hope, and one God."‡

But, alas! how have not the inspired expressions of imputed justice, as delivered by St. Paul, been perverted and wrested from their lawful sense, and catholic unity, as preserved and protected from the violence of man, in the unchangeable interpretations of the ancient Roman Church! "Let us, therefore, be persuaded," as St. Augustine says, "that the Gospel consists not in the words, but *in the sense*. A wrong explanation turns the Word of God into the word of man, and what is worse, into the word of the devil ; for the devil himself could quote the text of Scripture."§ If, then, we admit the truth of this position, so perfectly in unison with the dictates of right reason, and the constant teaching of our

* *Hist. des Var.*, Tome ii. Liv. xv. § 145.
† St. Hilary, Comment in Psal. xiv. p. 62.
‡ St. Hil. De Trin. L. viii. p. 951.
§ In Ep. ad Galat. contra Lucif.

infallible interpreter, where can be the difficulty of determining whether this imputed justice, which is actually formed in the new man, be or be not that very thing which justifies us in the sight of God? For, as our clear-sighted Bossuet accurately remarks, "a sanctity which does not make us holy, and a justice which does not make us just, were a subtlety quite unintelligible."

As it is God, moreover, who justifies his creatures, so also is it he that accounts them just. When he, who does nothing in vain, declares, does he not then also perform? Hath he said it, and shall he not do it? "Hear, Oh! ye heavens," saith the prophet, "for the Lord hath spoken." "If you be willing, and will hearken to me," then, "if your sins be as scarlet, they shall be made white as snow: and if they be red as crimson, they shall be white as wool."* And, now, when the shining and burning light of his Church, as a standing miracle to the world, reflects the living fulfilment of his prophetic words, shall *we* presume to question their omnipotence, by ascribing to them a legal fiction and subtlety of our own? Shall *we* dare to charge him with giving us a justice which does not make us just, but that the Infinite One simply and barely accounts it to us by the mere shadow of *a name?* How are the mighty fallen! when even the acknowledged citadel of their reform bears upon its front this ominous inscription of their own choice—

"Stat nominis Umbra!"

If men, therefore, will, after Osiander, dare to account to us the absolute and incommunicable justice of the Godhead, and call *this* the justifying and reputed grace of man, in order to reproach the Church of Christ with holding that we are made just by *our own proper* strength, and teach no other justice than *our own natural* virtue,† are we, on that account, to deny that the infused justice of God is not to be counted as our renewed justice, when we know, moreover, that it is his own gift, and is, thereby, made inherent in the regenerated creature, according to the unvarying traditions of his Holy Church? By her,

* Isaias i. 18, 19. † Vide Hist. des Var., L. iii. § 21, Tom. i.

it is held to be no less absurd to impute the essential righteousness of the Second Adam to his creature members, than it is to impute the personal sin of the first to the natural members of his race. That the Head satisfied for the members of his body, in such a manner that they *might in justice be treated* as if they themselves had obeyed the violated law, is altogether a different question from that of accounting to their persons an obedience which was rendered by Christ alone, and which, it is evident, is blasphemy to account, in this sense, to any living creature whatever. While the former position has ever been the teaching of the Church, the latter, on the other hand, has ever been the object of her most holy and indignant anathema.

But the imputation to the justified members of Christ, of the righteousness of his own body formed in them, is, indeed, the very basis of the Catholic doctrine of merits, which is so vehemently opposed by *the whole* of Protestant Christendom. This justice, therefore, having been procured and merited by Jesus Christ alone, in his own sacred person, under the law of death, has ever been, by his Church, accounted to be their merit, whenever it is communicated through the infusion of his Spirit. And since this is expressly grounded by the Word of God on the promise of a recompense, nothing, it is plain, can be more merited than eternal life ; and, at the same time, nothing more gratuitous. While the living faith and justice, moreover, of Abraham, is distinctly shown by St. James, to be connected with the merit of good works, the Catholic Church has ever taught, that " eternal life is," in the language of St. Augustine, " due to the merits of good works ; but the merits unto which it is due are gratuitously given us by our Lord Jesus Christ."*

In her definitions, also, on justifying grace, in the Council of Trent, she does but repeat her ancient decisions on the same. And when, in that Synod, she defined that remission of sin was given us, not by a simple, bare, or solitary imputation (*sola imputatio*) of the justice of Jesus Christ outwardly, but by a regeneration which renews us inwardly, " she did," in the language of Bos-

* Aug. ep. 105, num. 194, N. 19.

suet, "but repeat what formerly she had defined against the Pelagians, in the Council of Carthage."

"Conformably to these principles," continues our illustrious writer, "the same Council of Carthage understands by 'justifying grace, not only that which remits to us sins committed, but that also which assists us to commit them no more;' not only by enlightening our minds, but also by inspiring charity into our hearts, to the end, that 'we might fulfil God's commandments.' Now, the grace which works these things, is not a simple imputation, but is also an emanation of the justice of Jesus Christ; wherefore justifying grace is a different thing from such an imputation; and what was said in the Council of Trent, is nothing but a reflection of the Council of Carthage, whose decrees appeared by so much the more inviolable to the Fathers at Trent, as the Fathers of Carthage were sensible, in proposing them, they proposed nothing else on this subject, but what 'had always been approved of in the Catholic Church spread over the entire earth.'

"Our forefathers, therefore, did not believe, in order to destroy human glory and attribute all to Jesus Christ, that it was necessary, either to take from man that justice which was in him, or to diminish the value, or deny the effect thereof; but believed they ought to acknowledge it as proceeding from God only by a gratuitous bounty; and this, also, was what the Fathers of Trent acknowledged after them."*

But it may be argued that the Oxford school does not mean to uphold two distinct or separate *kinds* of righteousnesses, since Mr. Newman expressly says this is "not scriptural,"† and that the two are *in kind* "really one, and substantially the same thing," and have "an indentity in matter of fact." On this ground, therefore, the real meaning of their system is, that the "two righteousnesses, the one *perfect*, and the other *imperfect*," are simply, or merely, as Mr. Newman says, "*parts* of one gift." To this, however, we could only reply that, in such a case, they would *necessarily* consist of only two *fractional* parts of a unity, and could not, therefore, make up a *catholic* unity, in which, Mr. Newman distinctly says, he conceives the true doctrine to lie. And this, he maintains, is only to be found in the middle path of the *English* Church, which, according to him, is neither Protestant nor Roman; and which, Dr. Pusey also says, is "distinct from the bye-ways of ultra Protestantism on

* His. des Var., Tome ii. L. xv. § 143.
† Lectures on Justification, p. 62.

one side, and neither verging towards or losing itself in Romanism on the other."*†

Be this, however, as it may, the two considered as *mere parts*, whereof the one is said to be perfect, and the other imperfect, would, it is plain, effectually destroy either the unity of the kind, or the identity of the substance. In whatever light, then, we regard this doctrine of "two righteousnesses," it will be found altogether a hopeless task to maintain them on a principle of *unity*, to say nothing of their "catholicity," and their "identity in matter of fact." For, whether we call them *kinds* or *parts*, they are, in reality, the identical things which Hooker in his earlier days taught, when he affirmed that St. Paul "doth plainly sever one from the other;" and which, he never could, in his riper age, succeed in putting together again, by his equally illusive doctrine of partial imputation, coupled with partial infusion. They are, in fact, according to his theory, and that of Oxford, the severed fragments and remains of a disjointed system, through which it is no less vain to impute the merits of Jesus Christ, than to apply the name of Catholic unity. "He," says St. Cyprian, "that does not hold the unity of the Church, can he think that he holds the faith? He that opposes and withstands the Church, can he trust that he is in the Church? When the blessed Paul teaches the same thing, and shows the sacred character of unity, saying, (Ephes. iv. 4, 5, 6,) one body and one spirit, &c.; which

* Dr Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, p. 14.

† "Consider," says St. Augustine, "how great is the folly of heretics, severed from the Church of Christ; holding a part, and letting go the whole, they refuse to communicate with the whole world, over which the glory of Christ is spread. But *we Catholics are in every nation;* for in whatever land is the majesty of Christ, there we hold communion.—(*In Psal.* lvi. T. iv. p. 537.) A heretic comes forward, and says: I have people in Africa; and I, says another, elsewhere; whilst a third refers you to Galatia. Thou hast them in Africa; and he in Galatia; I look for a man, who can reckon believers with himself in every country. You dare to raise your hands, when you hear the words of the Psalmist: '*Let people confess thy praise, O God!*' but listen to the remainder: '*Let ALL people confess thy praise.*'—(Ps. lxvi.) Here is no exception. *Walk in the way with all nations; walk with all people;* ye children of peace, ye children of the one Catholic Church, walk in this way."—*Enarrat. in Psal.* lxvi.

unity, it is our duty firmly to hold and vindicate. *Hanc Ecclesiæ unitatem qui non tenet, tenere se fidem credit? qui Ecclesiæ renititur et resistit, in Ecclesia se esse confidit? Quam unitatem firmiter tenere, et vindicare debemus.*"*

Most truly has Mr. Knox declared, that "no writer on this earth is more misunderstood or misrepresented than St. Paul," on this subject of the accounted righteousness of our Redeemer.

The doctrine, therefore, of the Oxford school, that we are made acceptable by the righteousness of Jesus Christ in an *absolute* sense, and so saved by it in connection with a righteousness of our own, in an *inherent* sense, however different it may appear, in this form, from the system as held by other Protestant schools, is altogether repugnant to the truth of Christian salvation, as held and taught according to the Church of Rome. For it is the cardinal principle of the Catholic faith, that we cannot be accepted or saved, in any *partial* sense, or way, or degree, whatever, by a personal or imperfect righteousness of our own; but only and solely by the merits of Jesus Christ, according to the unity of his anointed justice, and the *unica formalis causa* of the holy canon of Trent. "The Apostle also," says St. Cyprian, "urging the same unity, entreats and admonishes, saying, (1 Cor. i. 10,) now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no schisms among you.

"God is one, and Christ is one, and his Church is one, and faith is one, and his people, connected by one solid bond, is one. Unity cannot be severed; nor the one body, by laceration, be divided. Whatever is separated from the stock, cannot live, cannot breathe apart: it loses the substance of life."†

However, then, the Oxford school may suppose their doctrine to be held by Catholic writers,‡ either before or

* De Unitate Ecclesiæ, p. 195.

† De Unitate Ecclesiæ, p. 202.

‡ What a strange idea, also, must Mr. Newman have of the Catholic faith, to imagine that, if some Catholic writers should describe it, as he says, in a different manner from what is taught in her general councils, that such teaching could possibly be the re-

after the sitting of the Council of Trent, we can only say that the Church of Rome has, from the times of the first Apostles, invariably held it to be utterly repugnant to *her* faith, to affirm that we are, or can be, in any sense or measure, accepted or saved by a righteousness of our own ; and which she further declares to be no other than a self-principle of works, according to the law, by which, in the words of St. Paul, "no flesh shall be justified."

Nevertheless, Mr. Newman says that "The view of justification taken by Romanists, and by a school of divines among ourselves, tends to fix the mind *on self*, not on Christ ; whereas that which I have advocated as Scriptural and catholic, *buries* itself in the *vision* of a present and indwelling God."*

If the Church of Rome really held the doctrine that the principle of man's justification was in any degree or in any way whatever connected with *a self*-righteousness of our own, then might Mr. Newman, with propriety, affirm that her view on the subject "tends to fix the mind on *self*, and not on Christ. But, as Mr. N.'s doctrine of catholic unity consists, *partly* in a righteousness of our own, in distinction from that of Jesus Christ's, we can

ceived doctrine of the Church. Are the Oxford writers, then, unacquainted at least with the profession of all Catholics on this subject ? Be it remembered, then, that their faith is, *of necessity*, everywhere the same, at one time as at another ; and that it is now, as it ever will be, professed by all as it was once described in the second century, in the following words of St. Irenæus :—

"The Church, extended to the boundaries of the earth, received her faith from the Apostles and their disciples. Having received it, she carefully retains it, as dwelling in one house, as possessing one soul, and one heart ; the same faith she delivers and teaches with one accord, and as gifted with one tongue ; for though in the world there be various modes of speech, the tradition of doctrine is one and the same. In the Churches of Germany, in those of Spain and Gaul, in those of the East, of Egypt, and of Africa, and in the middle regions, is the same belief, the same teaching. For as the world is enlightened by one sun, so does the preaching of one faith enlighten all men that are willing to come to the knowledge of the truth. Nor, among the pastors of the Church, does he that is eloquent deliver other doctrine ; for no one is above his master; nor he that is weak in speech diminish the truth of tradition. Faith being one, cannot be affected by the powers or the want of utterance."—*St. Irenæus adversus Hærises*, L. 1. c. pp. 48, 49.

* Lecture, p. 220.

only reply here, that while Catholics reject the former as one of the selfish works of the flesh, we cannot conceive how the Oxford view can possibly "*bury* itself in the *vision* (*!*) of a present and indwelling God,"—more especially as the object of this *vision* is represented by him to be the absolute righteousness of Christ; and, as we should otherwise have supposed, would naturally have been thought by him to be at least *invisible*.

It is plain, moreover, that the view of justification taken by the Oxford school professes, through a most unintelligible unity of its own, to *bury itself at once*, in the essence of Jesus Christ's divinity, together with a righteousness of *our own*. The only justice of God, therefore, by which the creature is made just, according to the unity of the ancient and Roman Church, being entirely lost sight of by the former, is, in this way, altogether left out of their peculiar and distinctive view.*

"But in the Catholic Church," says Vincent of Lerins, "we must be particularly careful to hold fast that doctrine which has been believed in all places, at all times, and by all. For, as the Word itself plainly denotes, there is nothing truly and properly Catholic, but that which comprehends all in general; now it will be so, if we follow universality, antiquity, and unanimous consent. We shall follow universality, if we believe that doctrine alone to be true which the Church everywhere admits. We shall follow antiquity, if we depart not from the opinions which our ancestors and fathers openly maintained. We shall follow unanimous consent, if we adhere to the sentiments of all, or of almost all, our pastors and teachers."†

This *via media*, also, of a *partial* salvation by our own justice, is not only another gospel from that which was "once delivered to the saints," but is, in fact and sub-

* "Hence," says Mr. Newman in another place, "the charge, not unfounded as regards Romanism, that it views or tends to view, the influences of grace, *not* as the operations of a living God, (what a charge !) but as a something to bargain about, buy, and traffic with, as if religion were, not an approach to things above us, (unintelligible ?) but a commerce with our equals concerning things we can master," (or understand !)—*Lecture*, p. 316.

† Commonit. I. n. ii. p. 317. Edit. Paris, 1684.

stance, however it may vary in form and structure, no other than the very basis of all the Protestant formularies or standards, which have given us an exposition of the reformed doctrine on the vital dogma of our justification. With all the English divines whom we have before cited, they one and all inculcate the doctrine of an outward and forensic imputation. On this point, the difference between them and the Oxford Divines consists in this, viz.: that while the former teach an acceptance of our persons, by the imputed justice of Jesus Christ, to the exclusion of an inward grace, the latter maintain an "absolute acceptableness," in union with an inherent righteousness of our own. In all the variations, therefore, of Protestant doctrine, we see, on the one hand, the same legal principle of a personal acceptance, and, on the other, the same visionary imputation of the absolute and essential justice of the Godhead. While some teach the acceptableness of *our own* righteousness, others again reject it as heretical; but, at the same time, each and every one hold *all* works, of whatever kind, whether of faith, or otherwise, to be utterly worthless before God "in the point of acceptation," as it is expressed by Usher, and as the doctrine is thus held by the great majority of Protestants. On the other hand, while Usher and the divines of his school in the English Church, count justifying faith as a barren and empty principle, the Westminster Confession, for example, of the Church of Scotland, defines it as an "evangelical obedience," though not sufficient, in their opinion, for "accounting and accepting our persons as righteous," since their creed maintains, for that end, nothing else than a bare or external imputation. But the peculiarity of the Oxford school consists in their holding that we are accepted and saved not only by the absolute righteousness of Jesus Christ, but also by our own proper or personal righteousness; in other words, partially, or to a certain extent, by the one, and partially, or to a certain extent, by the other. "That seamless garment," (which is equally the property of our Redeemer's body, as it is of the justice or righteousness which he procured for his members,) says the Patriarch of Alexandria, speaking of the Arians, "that

seamless garment which the murderers of Christ would not divide, these men have ripped asunder."*

Agreeably to this, the righteousness of Christ cannot, it is evident, be held as altogether or wholly sufficient for our salvation. The connection with it of our own imperfect righteousness, is maintained to be necessary and essential, according to the so-called unity of their peculiar system, as contradistinguished from "the Protestant" on the one hand, and "the Roman" on the other. The righteousness of Jesus Christ, therefore, although professedly held to be perfect, is, nevertheless, considered in their doctrine as insufficient of itself to save, seeing that it requires for this end, according to its avowed distinctions, the indispensable aid and union of another righteousness of our own.† Thus while it professes the perfect righteousness of Christ, on the one hand, it virtually denies his perfect atonement and effectual merits, on the other; for while it unlawfully magnifies our *own* virtues into a propitiatory sacrifice, it consequently takes from the holy Cross the peculiar and transcendent glory of its undivided unity. Hence the Oxford school, agreeably to its own *via media* of the two righteousnesses, hold that we are made acceptable, not as do the majority of the English Church, first by the one and then by the other, but by "both at once;" and, in this process, they *conceive to lie the unity of the Catholic doctrine !*‡

* St. Alexander apud Theodoret, L. c. iv. p. 10. Edit. Cantab. 1720.

† Lecture, pp. 414, 420, 428.

‡ Constantine the Great, who himself had called the bishops together at Nice in Bithynia, in a letter to the bishops who were not present at the Council, says: "What I chiefly proposed to myself was, that *one belief*, sincere affection, and uniformity of worship towards the Almighty Being, should be maintained."—*Gen. Conc.* T. ii. p. 263. In another letter to the Church of Alexandria, where Arius had first broached his new doctrines, the same Emperor attests, that "more than three hundred bishops, who were remarkable for their modesty and learning, proclaimed at Nice, with one voice, *one and the same faith;* and that Arius alone was found to dissent from it."—*Ibid*, p. 62. And yet, in a letter to Constantine, this heretic *professes his belief* "*in the one* Catholic Church of God, reaching from one extremity of the earth to the other."—*Gen. Conc.*, T. ii. p. 464. *Edit. Paris*, 1671.

However, therefore, the Oxford writers may flatter themselves with the idea that their middle way is in accordance with the opinion of some Roman divines, as they allege, of this we are sure and positive, that it is not to be found in any of their œcumenical councils, and that it cannot, therefore, in the nature of things, conduct its followers to the simplicity of the truth as it is in the body of Jesus Christ.*

The Council of Chalcedon, which was held in the fifth century, before its separation, addressed an *Allocution* to the Emperor, in which we find the following statement, showing the unchangeable character of the Catholic faith, and the reasons which require fresh expositions of its truth. "Were men satisfied," they say, "with the point of faith, and troubled not the path of rectitude by innovation, it would be the duty of the ministers of the Church to add nothing to what had been received. But because many deviate into error, forming *new ways* to themselves, it becomes necessary to oppose them by fresh *statements* of truth, and by just means to repel their *inventions;* not as if religion necessarily demanded such aids, but because they are efficacious against the inroads of error."†

Mr. Newman, also, in his maintenance of the Oxford doctrine, insists that, as justification "must mean an imputation, it cannot mean any thing else; for it cannot," he says, "have two meanings at once."‡ But, is it not evident that, while it cannot have two *opposite* meanings, any more than our salvation can be effected by two essentially distinct righteousnesses "at once," is it not plain, we ask, that it may include under its signification, not only an accounting of us to be just, but also, and at the same time, a making of us just? And if it means

* St. Jerome says, in a letter to Pope Damasus, written from the deserts of Syria, "I am following no other than Christ, united to the communion of your Holiness, *that is, to the chair of Peter.* I know that the Church is founded upon *that rock.*"—*Ep.* xiv. *ad Damasus*, T. iv. p. 19.

The Council of Milevis, which was held in the 5th century, in speaking of the same apostolic authority of the Holy See, says, "which authority is derived *from the authority of the Scriptures.*" — *Conc. Gen.* T. ii. p. 1545–6.

† Conc. Gen. T. iv. pp. 821, 828. ‡ Lect. pp. 70, 72.

that we are truly made just, as Mr. Newman admits, why not, also, *truly* accounted to be thus made? And if we are not only truly accounted and named, but actually made just by the righteousness of Jesus Christ, what reasonable occasion have we, then, to seek for two formal causes of our justification, when the only sufficient and proper one is to be found in the unity of his atoning justice, according to the apostolic sense and catholic doctrine of the Church of Rome?

But as the Oxford writers divide and sever Christ in the unity of his sanctifying justice, (after the example of the judicious Hooker, who affirms it, as he says, on the authority of St. Paul,) and of one, make two "Christian righteousnesses," so, in like manner, do they of his one body make two bodies. For they teach us that he has a *natural* (!) as well as a spiritual body; and that while the former only is limited to the heavens, the latter occasionally descends on the earth, in order to be in juxtaposition with the natural and earthly substances of bread and wine! And thus while St. Paul tells us that the natural body is one, and the spiritual body another, in order that these may not be confounded, nevertheless, they hold that both belong to the person of our Lord, so that while the one is present only in heaven, the other may be, at times, present on the earth.

But how, it may be asked, is this done? Why, by confounding the very person of our Lord with the very substance of his body, in like manner as they confound the essential justice of his divinity with the sanctifying justice of his creature members.

Thus, while, with all the rest of Protestantism, they maintain the monstrous doctrine of a "double or twofold Christian righteousness," do they also hold another no less monstrous than that of teaching a double or twofold body of our Lord. The former, however, still maintain their faith on the old and beaten track of their reform; but the Oxford school proclaim theirs by a teaching peculiar to itself, and under a *soi-disant* appellation or perverted name of "*Catholic* unity!"

Let us inquire, now, how they maintain their doctrine of two bodies, the one natural, and the other spiritual. In the first place, then, they deny that we actually partake of the substance of our Lord's body in the holy

Eucharist, and maintain that we merely eat and drink, with the sacramental forms, the natural substances only of bread and wine. Thus the bread, according to them, still remains, after its consecration, the same in nature as it was before,—a mere natural, inanimate element of brute and lifeless matter. But should they still maintain that we, nevertheless, eat the body in the sacrament; then, we ask how, and in what manner, do we eat the same according to the premises they assume? Now, it is easy to perceive that the question can be readily evaded by answering—after a heavenly and not after a carnal manner; but, at the same time, it is no less easy to perceive, according to *their own explanation of the manner*, that this evasion will never exonerate them from the charge, not only of denying our Lord's incarnate substance under its sacramental forms, and thereby of not discerning his body, but of holding, also, the no less monstrous doctrine of *eating the substance of his person!* and that, too, in a revolting conjunction with the mere earthly substances of bread and wine!

We need no miraculous change of substance in the elements, says Mr. Newman, "to convince *us* of the presence of the Lord incarnate." Where, we ask? In the sacramental forms of bread and wine? This they deny; for they maintain a presence there of only the natural substances themselves. If, therefore, it be not in the sacrament, or in the Eucharistic signs, it remains for the Oxford writers to say where they actually hold it to be, according to their own doctrine on the same. But as they are unable to answer so perplexing an inquiry, may we not justly affirm, that while they have in their teaching evidently taken away the Lord, they utterly know not where they have placed him?

Whatever, therefore, be their profession of a real presence *in the sacrament*, it is, in its very terms, an evident contradiction of their own self-assumed premises, to say nothing of the manifest blasphemy in teaching that the body of our Lord was there present in a heterogeneous union with the natural substances of mere brute matter.

With as much justice and propriety, also, might we affirm that Christ was, or is a *natural man*, as to teach that he had, or has a *natural body*. If the Oxford wri-

ters, however, only mean to hold that his body was *once* under the law, during the days of his flesh, and subject to the laws of natural being—but *now* no more—there certainly would be no manner of question on that point. But is this, we ask, a rational ground for believing that, therefore, it was, or could be a "*natural* (*!*) body," and that he has now a *natural* body in heaven, but a *spiritual* one on the earth.

But although his person cannot be separated from his humanity, or incarnate substance, the one is essentially distinct from the other. The two, therefore, although invariably connected, are never to be confounded. And as our communion with the former is only through the latter, it is evident, that while we may eat the substance of his flesh, it were impious to hold that in this we also eat the substance of his person. He is, therefore, personally present no less in the blessed sacrament of his Church on earth, than he is in the heaven of heavens. *Here* he is personally present with his body in the *consecrated* but temporal forms of bread and wine ; but *there* in his own proper and eternal form. For wherever his body is, there is his person also. Visible *here* only in the transient signs of earthly things,—*there*, in his own glorious and eternal image, being the brightness of his Father's majesty, "and the figure of his substance."—*χαρακτηρ της ὑποστασεως αυτου.**

While, therefore, in the Eucharist we have communion with his person, we, nevertheless, eat his body only ; and that not after a carnal, but only after a spiritual and a heavenly manner. And while we sensibly partake of the substance of his humanity, in the eating of his mysterious flesh in the sacrament, it is evident that we cannot partake of the substance of his divinity, although, at the same time, we most certainly have fellowship with his person, and that of the Father, if we receive the body in a worthy or acceptable manner.

Nevertheless, the Oxford Divines confound the body of Christ with his person, and the substance of his humanity with the substance of his divinity ; while, at the same time, they teach the no less monstrous doctrine of

* Heb. i. 3.

dividing his body in such a manner as to maintain that, while he has a *natural* (*!*) one in heaven, he has also a spiritual one on earth.*

* And yet Dr. Pusey declares "that Rome has grievously erred by explaining in a *carnal* (*!*) way the mode of this presence."—*Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford*, p. 89. That while their school, according to the article of their Church, maintains that the faith of the believer is *the mean* (or instrument) whereby the body is *eaten* (*!*) in the Supper, still they do not go so far as to say, with another school of their Church, that this faith is also "the true consecrating principle."—*Ibid*, p. 89.

After specifying a number of what he terms "the modern corruptions of Rome, which his Church in her articles condemns," he tells us that these all spring from the one *invention* of the doctrine of transubstantiation.—*Ibid*, p. 91. Nevertheless, he says, "deeply as Rome has erred we fear that others have erred more deeply;" viz., by such expositions of the real presence as have, in his view, virtually explained it away altogether.—*Ib.* p. 88.

In Tract No. 38, we find it asserted that "the doctrine of transubstantiation, as not being revealed, but a theory of man's devising, is profane and impious."—P. 11. And in Tract No. 81, it is very truly said, that "the doctrine of the Sacrifice (as we have already shown) *cannot be the same* where transubstantiation is held, and where it is not."—P. 47.

Dr. Pusey further says, in his work on Baptism, that "the error of transubstantiation has so modified other true doctrine, as to cast into the shade the one oblation once offered upon the Cross."—*Pusey on Baptism*, p. 6. And which offering he denies, with all the Protestant sects, to be now made on the Christian altar, in another manner from that in which it was once done on Calvary, and is, therefore, in other words, the same as to assert that it has now no being whatever; that its miraculous virtue has altogether ceased, and that it can now act no more. All this would be the inevitable consequence, if it could not be made now in a different form from that in which it was once and forever accomplished, in the days of our Lord's passion, under the law of death; but which, however, all must acknowledge, has no longer any dominion over him, or his perfect and most magnificent work.

In Tract No. 27, p. 2, they say, "As to the manner of the presence of the body and blood of our Lord in the blessed sacrament, we that are Protestant and Reformed, according to the ancient Catholic Church, do not search into the manner of it with perplexing inquiries," &c.

Notwithstanding, however, we would refer our readers to the celebrated Tract No. 90, as containing a full and detailed exposition of the manner of this presence, according to the views of this new school, in opposition to the ancient doctrine of our Church on the same.

In this explanation, however, of the Oxford view, we shall vainly seek for any consistency of sober and intelligible reasoning, to say nothing of its utter want of that essential unity and beauty which

But the Catholic Church has invariably held that Christ is one—ever one—in his person, as in the temporal forms of his body here, and in its eternal and glorious form hereafter.

We return, now, from this digression on the doctrine of a *two-fold or double* body, to the subject of the two righteousnesses, and which is but another distinctive badge of every school which professes to be separated from the Holy See, whatever be the self-assumed appellation by which it is "nominated in their bond," or their so-called Christian covenant. For in none does it show itself more prominently than in that of Oxford, notwithstanding its formal repudiation of the name of Protestantism.

While the essential righteousness, therefore, of our Lord's divinity, is, by the Oxford doctrine, formally accounted to us for our "*absolute* acceptableness," the imperfect righteousness of our own, which they connect with it in the process of our justification, is actually denominated by Mr. Newman, "the propitiation for our sins," in God's sight!* Surely, our own righteousness can never be the propitiation for our sins; and it is no less certain there can be no other righteousness given under heaven whereby we may be saved or accepted, but that only which is imparted to us in the propitiatory merits of his indwelling and sanctifying justice. There is not, moreover, a single heretical opinion which may not be traced to this very doctrine,—that *our own* righteousness is, as Mr. Newman insists, an "acceptable obedience." It is, indeed, a necessary and inevitable consequence of that distinction of the two so-called Christian

belong to the Catholic doctrine, and to the seamless vesture of our Lord's mysterious humanity.

"Reflecting often on these things," says Vincent of Lerins, in alluding to changes of doctrine, "I am astonished at the error in some men, who, not content with the Rule of Faith once delivered and received, are ever seeking for something new, and are ever anxious to add to religion, to change, or to take away; as if what was once revealed, was not a celestial dogma, but a human institution, which, to be brought to perfection, required constant emendation, or rather correction. If novelty must be shunned, antiquity must be held fast; if novelty be profane, antiquity is sacred."—*Common.* n. xxi. p. 348.

* Lecture, p. 39.

righteousnesses which we have shown to be held by Hooker, and Andrews, and Usher, and Hooper, and Beveridge, and, in a word, of every Protestant divine and sect in Christendom. And however this distinction may be held with a profession of catholic unity, it is, in fact, a principle of severance, alike at variance with the catholic faith, and with the connecting bond of catholic peace and fellowship. For, as long as it is maintained to be a principle of Christian truth, it is altogether nugatory to say that the imperfect righteousness which is called "our own," in contradistinction from the perfect righteousness of Christ, is not *meant* to be an obedience done "in our natural state and by our own strength;"* for it is, notwithstanding, according to the very terms and boasted feature of the Oxford *via media*, *another* righteousness than the *perfect one* of Jesus Christ, and, therefore, altogether distinct from its sacred unity, as taught by the Apostles of our Lord, and professed in the communion of the Church of Rome.†

Yet this "middle way" of doctrine is maintained to have come down to their Church through a divine and ancient tradition, notwithstanding it would seem to be confined only to their own school. For "*we*," says Dr. Pusey, "bear no human name; *we* look to no human founder; *we* have no one reformer to set up as an idol; *we* are *neither of Paul nor of Apollos;* nor have *we* any human maxims or theories as the basis of our system; but *we* have been led back at once to the *distant* (*!*) fountains, where the waters of life, fresh from their source, (once) flowed most purely."‡ And have the waters of

* Lecture, pp. 66, 67.

† Eusebius, in speaking of Hegesippus, who belonged, in the second century, to the Church of Jerusalem, says of him, "In the books which have come down to us, he relates of himself, that as he went to Rome, he visited many bishops, and heard from all, *one and the same doctrine*, την αυτην παρα παρα παντων παρειληφε διδασκαλιαν. They called the Church (he says) a virgin, because as yet she had not been corrupted by *vain opinions*. From the heretics who then rose, came false Christs, false prophets, and false apostles; and these introducing counterfeit doctrine against God and against his Christ, *severed the unity of the Church*," and by consequence, the unity also of its faith.—*Apud Euseb. Hist. Eccle.* L. iv. c. xxii. p. 181. Edit. Cantabrigiæ, 1720.

‡ Pusey on Baptism, pp. 105, 106.

life, indeed, ceased to flow, or do they flow *less purely* now, than they did in ancient times? Does Dr. Pusey, then, really imagine that the unbelief or scandals of barren members in the Church of God, can, in any way, impair its most holy faith, or cause its unsullied streams to mingle with those "whose waters cast up mire and dirt?" In a word, will the Oxford school persuade men that the ancient fountain, where the waters of life once flowed most purely from its eternal source, is now exhausted, and become like a broken cistern that can hold no water?

Under every point of view, then, we find it to be another gospel; a real bondage to shadows; and a vain disjointed principle of the Protestant and anti-Catholic system of imputation. If there is, indeed, a righteousness within that is *our own*, it surely cannot be a gift of grace; but if it is of grace, then it is *not* our own, and no other than the unity of that justifying principle which is in Jesus Christ and his members; and which, while it justifies by his Spirit, also sanctifies by the same.

But this doctrine is to be found nowhere but in the Catholic Church, and to be taught by her alone. For without her sacred walls, it is not possible that the weary pilgrim can securely trace the apostolic pathway of unerring light. "How can the traveller," says St. Ambrose, "walk in the night? His foot stumbles in the night, unless the moon, as it were, the eye of the world, point out the way. Thou art also in the night of the world. *Let the Church point out to thee the way;* monstret tibi Ecclesia viam. Let the Sun of justice enlighten thee from on high, in order that thou mayest be secure from a fall."*

"If devils are cast out by the finger of God, *faith is discovered by the finger of the Church.*† The new and the old, my beloved, I have kept for thee.‡ I keep all the commandments of the Old and New Testaments. *The Church alone is able to say this.* No other congregation can say so; neither the synagogue, which does not keep *the new commandments according to the let-*

* Enar. in Ps. xxxv. T. p. 776.
† In Lucam, l. v. T. I, p. 1378. ‡ Cant. vii. 13.

ter, nor the old according to the spirit: nor can the Manichæan heresy, which rejects the prophets, make use of the expression. With reason is she clothed in white, who shines with the grace of *both* Testaments.* Error had led away one sheep, but the grace of the Lord gathered together a multitude of people. Man erred, but the Church is now become a wall, and a strong wall.† The Lord said to Moses, *the place whereon thou standest is holy ground*, (Exod. iii.) *and stand thou here with me*, (Deut. v.) that is, thou standest with me, *if thou standest in the Church.* That is the holy place, that is the land fruitful in holiness, and rich in harvest of virtue. Stand, therefore, in the Church; stand where I have appeared to thee; there I am with thee; *where the Church is, there is the most secure port for thy mind.*"‡

St Chrysostom has left us a homily in which he, also, expressly inculcates the same respect and submission to the Church, "whose greatness," he says, "is such that when combated, she comes off victorious; when slandered, she shines with additional lustre. *Ὑβριζομενη λαμπροτερα καθισταται.* For what can be equal in power and strength to the Church of God? Talk not of walls, nor of arms; for walls decay with time; but the Church never grows old with age. The devils themselves cannot overcome the Church."§

Mr. Newman, however, goes on to define the *manner* in which he conceives us to be made inwardly just, agreeably to the Oxford distinction of an acceptable and imperfect obedience, as distinguished from the perfect righteousness of Jesus Christ. "We become," he says, "inwardly righteous in the *same sense* in which we are utterly reprobate by nature." But, as it is only by the law of condemnation, and in that sense alone, that we are found and accounted to be sinners by nature, surely we cannot, in *this same sense*, become inwardly righteous; for what, then, becomes of the law of grace in Christ, or where would be the room for its exercise, and how could we be saved from those judgments, according

* St. Ambrose, Serm. xxii. in Psal. cxviii. T. 1, p. 1255.
† Ibid. ‡ Epist. Lib. iii. T. iv. p. 119.
§ Hom. de non contimnenda Ecclesia, T. xii. p. 491. Edit. Montfaucon, Paris, 1735.

to which, if the Lord should observe iniquities, "Lord, who shall endure it?"*

It is, however, superfluous to multiply arguments against a position which is universally disclaimed, as well by the Protestant as by the Catholic. But such is the character of error that it necessarily carries with it its own refutation; and hence we find that, while the Oxford school profess that we are not and cannot be justified by obedience "in our natural state, and by our own strength," as Mr. Newman acknowledges is "admitted on all hands,"† since, *by nature*, we are condemned as sinful, yet does he also maintain the self-evident contradiction that, in *the same way*, and in *the same sense*, we become inwardly righteous! Since the Oxford Divines, moreover, deny that we can become formally just simply, that is, according to the simplicity which is in Christ, by the inward operation only of his infused justice, and as it is evident that the catholic unity of this formal cause is not to be found in their system, it is no less certain, that the manifold contradictions it involves, are not to be evaded, save only in an entire abandonment of their new doctrine of salvation, in part by the righteousness of Jesus Christ, and in part by another of our own. "As children of light and truth, therefore, let us," in the words of St. Ignatius, "avoid the division of unity, and the bad doctrines of heresy. Where the shepherd is, do you, like sheep, follow."‡

While the Divinity of Oxford, therefore, together with that of Protestantism in general, is equally characterized by the self-same distinction of legal imputation, and of holding two righteousnesses instead of one, the former, nevertheless, varies chiefly in its profession of *a new name*, and by its vain attempt to join together things which God hath put apart, and that too under the misapplied appellation of *catholic* unity, coupled with a *middle way* of improved and reformed Christianity!

But when the mind of man, says St. Cyril of Alexandria, has departed from the right road and from true belief, "to reform itself is easy, if it will but carefully

* Psalm cxxix. † Lect. pp. 66, 67.
‡ Ep. ad Phila. p. 31.

examine what the fathers have written, whom all esteem for the truth and rectitude of their opinions; and thus will be discovered what true faith is. For men whose hearts are upright wish to follow them. They having stored their minds with the doctrines delivered by the Apostles, and treated the points of belief in a manner void of all blame, became the lights of the world."*

It is not for us to determine which of the two systems is the most fraught with error, or which of the two is the least dangerous in leading us from a knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus Christ,—whether that which teaches us to rely only upon an imputation to us of the absolute or essential justice of the Divinity, or that which inculcates the doctrine that we are justified and saved partly by that righteousness, and partly by our own. It is sufficient for us to know that they are, each and both, at variance with the simplicity and unity of the truth as it is in the Church of Rome. But as our inquiry at present is in relation to the merits and peculiar features of the Oxford doctrine, we can only say, that it cannot possibly be defended against the charge of holding that we are saved by our own works, or the inherent principles of our own nature. Not, however, that we suppose, for a moment, that such an imputation would not be immediately repudiated, but that the doctrine itself, as explained and illustrated by its supporters, necessarily leads to the above-named consequences.

We know, indeed, that Mr. Newman distinctly says that, "in our natural state and by our own strength, we are not and cannot be justified by obedience," for this, he adds, "is admitted on all hands," or, in other words, is the universally acknowledged sentiment of the nominally Christian world. But still we maintain that the above-named result is the necessary tendency of their doctrine, as tested by the logical principles of the written word, according to the power and unity of its faith, as held by its living interpreter and judge, and as is witnessed, moreover, by the sentiment, "admitted on *all* hands," proclaiming it to be another gospel from that which was once delivered to the Apostles of our blessed Lord.

* Apol. Adv. Oriental., Anathem. viii. T. vi. p. 177. Edit. Paris, 1638.

The views, also, of the Oxford Divines in relation to the merits of a judge and interpreter in deciding upon the doctrines of religious truth, are no less remarkable than on the questions immediately before us. We observe, therefore, that while Dr. Pusey makes "Scripture *alone*," *and* (*!*) the consent of antiquity, the judge of his Church, Mr. Newman says that her article on the sufficiency of Scripture alone, "is very plain and clear, *except in one point*, viz.: who is to be the judge of what is, and what is not contained in Scripture. Our Church," he continues, "is silent on this point—very emphatically so. This is worth observing; in truth, she does not admit, strictly speaking, of *any judge at all*."

Now, the inquiring reader would naturally be curious to know how this apparent discrepancy between these two advocates of the same system, or how the apparent inconsistencies of each statement with itself, is attempted to be reconciled. This Mr. Newman explains by saying that his Church does, nevertheless, allow of a judge, *that is to say*, in a *certain* sense of their own, or according to their "middle course," which, on this point, as well as on others, they profess to hold between these extreme theories, which, according to their view, are maintained by all the Christian world, save themselves only, or their own school alone. In the common, or usual meaning of the term, or in the sense in which he says Romanists and Protestants contend for a judge, he candidly admits she is not one. Her authority, therefore, as a judge, according to Mr. Newman, signifies, in the doctrine of his school, not, strictly speaking, that of a "judge at all," but that of a witness only; or rather, of "a keeper and witness, viz.: of *Catholic* (*!*) tradition."*

* "In supposing," says Dr. Milner, "our Saviour to have appointed his bare written word for the rule of our faith, without any authorized judge to decide on the unavoidable controversies growing out of it, we would suppose that he has acted differently from what common sense has dictated to all other legislators. For where do we read of a legislator, who, after dictating a code of laws, neglected to appoint *judges and magistrates to decide their meaning*, and to enforce obedience to such decisions? And what would be the consequences of leaving any act of parliament, concerning taxes, or enclosures, or any other temporal concerns, to the interpretation of the individuals whom it regards?"—*Milner's End of Controversy*, p. 34.

"But heresies," says St. Augustine, "have not arisen, nor certain pernicious doctrines, except from the Holy Scriptures being ill understood, and where rash and bold assertion has been the consequence."*

The above definition, however, it is to be noted, is only in a peculiar and extraordinary sense of their own, alike unknown to Protestantism on the one hand, as to the Church of Rome on the other. For his Church, Mr. Newman says, neither allows individuals to exercise their judgment on dogmas of faith, nor does she even permit herself to have any power at all of this kind. The sole authority, therefore, of determining in matters of controversy is, in this novel and "middle" sense of the term, vested in "Scripture *alone and* the consent of primitive antiquity;" and this to the entire exclusion both of the Church and all its members! While Mr. Newman, therefore, argues that the Church herself, according to their middle course, does not admit of any judge at all, in the usual sense of the term among Protestants and Catholics, Dr. Pusey maintains that "Scripture alone" and tradition is her judge; but only in accordance with their own definition, which expressly limits the word to a mere "witness and keeper."†

Still, however, if we should admit "Scripture alone" and tradition to be the judge, in the sense conceived by Dr. Pusey, in what sense, and by whom, we ask, is Scripture and tradition to be judged? For their Church, on these matters, preserves an emphatic silence, simply because she has no authority to speak either as a judge or an interpreter. If it be not denied, therefore, that decisions are still to be made in some way, is it not most plain and clear, in every point of view, that any member,

* Tract No. xviii. Joan. Evang. part 2, T. iii. p. 430.

† "Alluding to the Protestant rule, the illustrious Fenelon has said, 'It is better to live without any law, than to have laws which all men are left to interpret according to their several opinions and interests.' The Bishop of London appears sensible of this truth, as far as regards temporal affairs, where he writes, 'In matters of property, indeed, some decision, right or wrong, must be made; society could not subsist without it; just as if peace and unity were less necessary in the *one sheepfold of the one shepherd*, the Church of Christ, than they are in civil society!'"—*Milner's End of Controversy*, p. 34.

or school of members, may make both Scripture and the Church speak just such doctrines as they please; and, according to St. Augustine, "turn the Word of God into the word of man; and what is worse, into the word of the devil?"*

* That the reader, however, may be better enabled to judge more accurately of the meaning of this doctrine, as taught by the English Church, on its peculiar mode of determining religious truth, we will here insert the two statements, above referred to, of Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman, in their own language. "Our Church," says Dr. Pusey, "blessed be God, never took Luther, or Calvin, or any modern name, for its teacher or its model, but primitive antiquity: and by the Holy Scripture alone, and the universal consent of Primitive Antiquity, as the depository of its doctrines, and the witness of its teaching, would she be judged. In these principles of our dear mother, the Church of England, have we been trained, and in these old ways would we humbly tread."—*Pusey on Baptism*, p. xvii.

"This statement," says Mr. Newman, "'that Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation,' (Art. VI.) is very plain and clear except in one point, viz., who is to be the judge of what is, and what is not contained in Scripture. Our Church is silent on this point—very emphatically so. This is worth observing; in truth she does not admit, strictly speaking, of any judge at all, in the sense in which Romanists and Protestants contend for one; and in this point, as in others, holds a middle course between extreme theories. Romanism, as we all know, maintains the existence of a judge of controversies; nay, an infallible one—that is, the Church Catholic. Again, the multitude of Protestants consider every man his own judge; they hold that every man may, or must read Scripture for himself; and judge about its meaning, and make up his mind for himself. We neither hold that the Catholic Church is an infallible judge of Scripture, nor that each individual may judge for himself; but that the Church has authority, and that individuals may judge for themselves outside the range of that authority. The Church is not a judge of the sense of Scripture in the common sense of the word, but a witness, a keeper and witness of Catholic tradition. She bears witness to a fact that such and such a doctrine, or such a sense of Scripture, has ever been received, and came from the Apostles."—*Newman on Romanism*, p. 327, *et seq.*

"If every art," says St. Augustine, "however low and easy of attainment, still, to be acquired, *demands a teacher*, (and by consequence a judge,) what can be more arrogant, than not to be willing to learn those books of divine mysteries from their proper interpreter, and to condemn what is not understood?"—*L. de utilitate credendi*, c. 17, Tom. viii. p. 69. "For my part," says he to a Manichæan, "I would not give credit to the Gospel, unless the authority of the Catholic Church induced me to it."—*Contra ep. Fundam. Ibid*, p. 154.

We now ask the candid reader's attention to an opposite passage, from the writings of St. Jerome, on the nature and meaning of a judge to instruct us in the right and legitimate sense of Scripture. As his statement conveys the received understanding of the Catholic Church, on the true character and office of such a divine guide as is necessary to preserve us from error, we quote the same, not only for the admirable plainness of the teaching, but as a most striking contrast to the obscurity of the Oxford definition.

"These things (some passages of Scripture) I have lightly touched on," says St. Jerome, "that you may be convinced how necessary a guide is, when you enter on the study of the Scriptures. I say nothing of grammarians, rhetoricians, philosophers, and of other learned professions, the knowledge of which is so useful, and the rules of which are laid down. Let me speak of menial acts, such as are learnt, not by lectures, but by practice. In all these, however, there must be some one to show the way.—The art of understanding the Scriptures alone is open to every reader! Here, learned or unlearned, we can all interpret. The tattling old woman, the doating old man, the wordy sophist, all, all here presume; they *tear texts asunder*, and dare become teachers before they have learned. Some you may see, surrounded by a female circle, weighing out, with a solemn brow, their pompous phrases, and discussing the import of these sacred oracles: while others, Oh, shame! are taking lessons from the women, that they may be able to instruct the men. I speak not of those who, like myself, coming to the study of the Holy Scriptures from profane authors, and the exercises of worldly eloquence, vainly fancy all they utter to be the law of God; not deigning to learn what the prophets, and what the Apostles thought. In support of their own conceptions they adduce incongruous proofs; not aware that, to distort sentences, and to force the reluctant Scripture to bend to their own wishes, argues not a superior understanding, but is a mode of teaching the most faulty."*

Notwithstanding, however, the above acknowledgment

* Ep. L. T. iv. Pars. 11, p. 571.

of Mr. Newman, it is evident that this is directly contradicted by his own peculiar doctrine, viz.: that we are saved partly by the righteousness of Jesus Christ, and partly by our own; or, in other words, by the efficacy, as he also distinctly says, of "both at once."* This, we maintain, is a doctrine which directly teaches that we are made just and acceptable in and by our own strength, and according to the principles and laws of our own natural or depraved condition.

On the other hand, the ordinary, or more general Protestant doctrine, teaches, that we are only accounted to be just by a supposed or fictitious operation of the law, and that we are altogether incapable of performing any meritorious works whatever, or which are worthy of being considered good or pleasing in the sight of God, although done in and by his grace, and not by our own strength or righteousness. While, therefore, the Oxford doctrine teaches that we are made acceptable, in part, by our own obedience, the ordinary Protestant doctrine holds that we are not really made just at all in any way, and that we are not even accounted so, by any inherent or inwrought grace whatever. And although the latter is the doctrine of Protestants generally, the system of all their sects being founded upon one and the same principle of a legal interpretation, it is, however, more zealously inculcated by the advocates of a school of which the Rev. G. S. Faber, in his treatise "On the Primitive Doctrine of Justification," gives us no unambiguous account.

The class of divines, however, from whose writings we have quoted, are generally considered to dissent from the systems of the various reformed churches of the continent, while the one to which Mr. Faber professes his adherence, is that form of doctrine which is most commonly adopted by the great majority of Protestant Christendom.

Our readers will sufficiently understand its nature and character by the following extract from the above-named work.

"If we adopt," says Mr. Faber, "the system recom-

* Lecture p. 320.

mended to us by these authorities ancient and modern, the modern being swelled by the assent of the various reformed churches of the continent, we shall encounter no imperious and perplexing requisition to draw a line between sufficiency and insufficiency; for, in that case, we shall build our justification, not upon the ever-shifting sands of man's imperfect and *inherent* righteousness, but upon the immoveable rock and *absolute** *cubical* (*!*) *unity of the perfect and finished righteousness of Christ.*"†

In the above we perceive that all our sufficiency is accounted to us as depending altogether and exclusively upon a righteousness which is the attribute only of the incomprehensible and alone essence of the august Trinity and Unity of the Godhead; or, in other words, of that absolute justice whereby he is just in himself alone. We are not, indeed, according to this system, said to be made just, but *only so accounted* by its legal and most fallacious imputation. The two righteousnesses, which are here spoken of, are, first, the incommunicable justice of the Godhead, and secondly, an inherent righteousness of our own, which, notwithstanding it is uniformly compared in Scripture to filthy rags, is nevertheless, in this

* And thus it is, that while Protestantism makes her decrees concerning free-will, and election, and reprobation, and predestination, in a manner altogether *absolute*, and in a mode which, it is said, is entirely independent of the creature's choice and conduct, so does she also interpret her favorite dogma of imputation in the same forbidden and unlimited sense.

The following passage of the admirable "Geraldine," is so apposite to our purpose, that we cannot forbear the pleasure of its insertion.

"Here I can only repeat," says the accomplished authoress, "what I have before urged on the subject, that while one set of Christians believe and teach that they are accepted *unconditionally*, and the other class believe and teach that they are accepted *conditionally*, they never can agree, and seldom understand each other. The Catholic believes that in and by Christ he is forgiven, *provided* he fulfils the terms stipulated by his adorable Master; but that this obedience to his commands should be a substitute for him who gave them, and that *practical* repentance is carnal pride," and in no way differing, before baptism, from the faith of evil spirits: "all these inconsistent assertions, these absurd contradictions, prove to me only still further, the blind hatred against the Catholic Church, which Satan, as an angel of light, breathes into every Protestant mind."—(P. 131.)

† Faber's Prim. Doc. of Justification, p. 211.

system, maintained to be our only true holiness and sanctification; and this, after we shall have been reputed just by a righteousness in which it is evident that no creature can ever share. This imaginary and air-built edifice of human device is, moreover, said to be founded upon the "absolute *cubical* (!) unity of the perfect and finished righteousness of Christ."

Now since all, with the exception only of the Oxford school, acknowledge that we are formally justified only by the righteousness of Jesus Christ, the question imperatively comes before us in the absorbing inquiries, what do we mean, in the first place, by its merits, and in the next, in what *manner* are we justified by them?

In answer to the first question, we say that, according to the doctrine of the great majority of Protestants, these merits are supposed and held to consist in the absolute and essential righteousness of our Lord's divinity, whereby he is just, as God *in himself alone*. This is the meaning or sense in which they are exclusively made to rest, agreeably to their leading principle, which, in the words of Mr. Faber, is called "the absolute and cubical unity of the perfect and finished righteousness of Jesus Christ."* But in the Oxford school they are made, as we have seen, to consist partly in our own, and partly in the righteousness of Christ.

With regard now to the second inquiry, as to the *manner* in which we are justified by these merits, it is held by one and all of the various sects, without exception, that this is effected through a system of legal imputation, and which, we have before shown, is alike contrary to the scriptural imputation of St. Paul, and to the unity of the faith, as it is taught in the Catholic Church. It is unnecessary to repeat here what we have already said in regard to the general nature or character of this imputation, and will merely remark that the Oxford Divines,

* "The absolute cubical unity," as advocated by this school, does not appear to be professedly connected with a catholic unity, but is merely characterized as being in contradistinction from that kind of inherent righteousness which, in their system, is not unfrequently denominated, in the language of Bishop Hopkins, a "*physical* righteousness," and in that of Andrews, *a righteousness in the concrete* and not *in the abstract*.

according to their *via media*, hold by the righteousness of Christ, the imputation to us of an "absolute acceptableness," while they also maintain that we are saved, "at once," both by this and by our own together.

What, now, is the answer to the above questions, on the ground of the Catholic doctrine? We reply, then, in regard to the first, that these merits consist not in that absolute and incommunicable righteousness wherewith he is just in himself alone, according to the attribute of his incomprehensible Godhead, but simply in that righteousness wherewith he makes us just, and which is that gift of justification, and sanctification, and of redemption, which he procured for us, by his obedience and passion in our nature, under the law, by which we sinned and fell. And is it not evident that this righteousness, in and by which his merits are imparted to us, is *not an absolute*, but simply a *conditional* gift of Christ, offered and granted, indeed, to all who are willing to accept it, but, nevertheless, according to the freedom of its own terms, and the spiritual character of its own sacred obligations?

The holy decree of the Council of Trent runs as follows, (and we cannot here forbear calling our readers' attention to the beauty, and simplicity, and precision of its language:) "Unica formalis causa est justitia Dei, non qua ipse justus est, sed qua nos justos facit, qua, videlicet, ab eo donata, renovamur Spiritu mentis nostri, et *non modo reputamur*, *sed vere justi nominamur*."

The scholastic distinctions, therefore, however harsh they may sound to some modern ears, have nevertheless been consecrated by their adoption into the language of the Church; and while they evince their power and efficacy in preserving the purchased faith in the catholic unity of our Lord, they, at the same time, keep inviolate the independent and self-existing properties of his alone Identity. They are, in fact, the only distinctions which can guard us against that confusion of mind which would confound the essential and uncreated attributes of our Lord's person with the distinct and created qualities of his body. For, while he is acknowledged by all Christians to be the meritorious cause of our justification, the definition of *the one formal cause*, as expounded in the

Council of Trent, is the key which unlocks the mystery on the controverted manner in which his merits are applied and accounted to the renewed members of his body.

The righteousness, therefore, in which the merits of Jesus Christ consist, is, according to the *Catholic* doctrine, as taught in the Roman Church, to be found in the unity only of that faith and charity which is shed abroad in the hearts of those who are thus made righteous or just.

And in regard to the second inquiry, viz., the *manner* in which we are saved by them, it is not, as we see, by a supposed legal imputation of *that justice* which it is profane to account to the creature *in any way*, but by a true, evangelical, and apostolic imputation to the justified, of that faith which they receive as their righteousness in Christ, and his righteousness in them.

How different this from the Protestant or forensic imputation according to a sentence of the law! How unlike the shadowy and unmeaning system which accounts us to be just, and, at the same time, *denies that we are made so!* How contrary to the visionary imputation which reckons to the creature a justice which belongs to the Creator alone; which confounds the essential attributes of God with the gracious endowments of man; which ascribes to us a justice which it would be blasphemy to account, either to the archangel himself, or even to the highest of all creatures, the blessed mother of our blessed Lord; an imputation which attributes to "*the persons of men*," an acceptableness which it denies even to living faith itself; and which, in order to establish and complete the climax of its folly, even ventures to account the Immaculate Victim of the Cross, as "a transgressor and A SINNER!" in order that we might, according to its *forensic* character, be reputed just by a judicial process of the law! Strange, indeed, that the doctrine of his humiliation, in the days of his flesh, without sin, was not sufficient for professed teachers of Christianity, but that they should conceive the monstrous idea of an imputative degradation to his character! Can man, then, we ask, justly wonder and complain, that a system like this should be sealed with an indignant and

holy anathema by "the Church of the living God"—that sacred and inspired body, whose peculiar office and province it is to guard with ceaseless vigilance, through the teaching authority of the Holy Ghost, that precious and invaluable deposit which was "once delivered to the saints?" For, "who," says St. Cyril of Jerusalem, "but the Divine Spirit, whose word the Scriptures are, can understand the hidden things of God? But even that Spirit has not spoken in the Scriptures, of the generation of the Son of God from the Father. Then why will you inquire into that which is not there written? You that do not know what is written, be not curious in other things. Many points are there delivered, which we comprehend not: what is not delivered, we should not attempt to know."*

Now, as the Oxford Divinity, also, perpetuates a severance of the faith, and an opposition to its unity by the maintenance of two Christian righteousnesses, it will but vainly seek to justify itself, by imputing to writers in the Church of Rome a distinction which her councils so emphatically condemn. Of this, too, we are certain, that no Catholic divine could teach a doctrine, whether of justification or of salvation, by two Christian righteousnesses, without being guilty, if persisted in, of inexcusable heresy, and of being justly accounted an enemy to the Church of Christ, and to the unity and sanctity of the faith upon which she is essentially and eternally built.

For, as the Catholic Church is, in the language of St. Clement of Alexandria, "a people collected into one faith," and as this faith is the justice of God formed in them in their baptism, it is *essentially one* in the body, according to the doctrine of all the Apostles, as, also, in the words of the same illustrious Catechist, "*all that they delivered was one;* and, in this way," he adds, "all arrive at the *unity* of the faith."†

Mr. Newman, nevertheless, affirms that the distinction, with his school, of the two Christian righteousnesses, "is allowed in the Church of Rome, (!) and held by Ro-

* Catech. xi. n. xii. p. 154.
† Strom. L. vi. pp. 736, 793.

manists both before the Council of Trent and after." To this we can only say, that in the first place, Mr. Newman mistakes greatly in affirming that it is allowed in the Church, or has been so at any period whatever. In the next place, we are entirely at a loss, from his own showing, how he can imagine in his statements respecting the views of St. Thomas Aquinas, that there is any agreement whatever between them and his own, in relation to the very peculiar distinction of their own *Via Media*, and which he and Dr. Pusey so emphatically disclaim as being either the Roman or the Protestant faith. In the third place, if it could be made out or shown that any Catholic divine, or any number of them had, at any period, entertained this distinction, we are entirely at a loss, we confess, to discover even the semblance of a reason why this should incline their readers to conceive a partiality in favor of the doctrine, when, from their own statements, it would appear that one of its peculiar merits professedly consisted in its dissent from a characteristic dogma of the Roman faith. And, in the fourth place, we cannot conceive how *their* peculiar distinction could be consistently maintained by them, as a *via media, if it were, in reality, an allowed* (*!*) *doctrine of the Roman Church.*

Mr. Newman, however, states, in confirmation of his views, that "St. Thomas contends that the *gratia justificans* (the justifying righteousness) is not the same as the habit of love; the latter belonging to the will, and the former to the essence of the soul. In which opinion he is followed by Cajetan, Conradus, Scoto, and others. Bonaventura assents so far as to consider there is a real distinction between them. This alleged distinction was a subject of dispute at the Council of Trent, between the Franciscans and Dominicans, on all which accounts it was left unsettled by the Fathers there assembled."*

Now, it is most certain, that in the above statement, no resemblance whatever can be found to the avowed and peculiar distinction of the Oxford school. Where, for instance, is there the least intimation, in this paragraph, of two distinct Christian righteousnesses, or of

* Newman's Lectures, p. 397.

the one being external and perfect, and the other inherent and imperfect? And with regard either to the "*gratia justificans*," or to the "habit of love," as mentioned above, how is it possible for the Oxford school to identify either of these with either one or the other of their righteousnesses? According to the extract, *both* of the principles there stated are described as *belonging to us*, and as infused or inherent properties of the renewed man; whereas, only one of the righteousnesses of the Oxford school is, by them, admitted to be inherent, while the other is distinctly held to be *external to us*, and, therefore, no property or quality whatever of our new or justified nature.* In the above statement, moreover, of St. Thomas, we find but *one* justifying righteousness spoken of, whereas the Oxford doctrine distinctly and emphatically holds to *two*.

In every point of view, therefore, in which the doctrine of the Oxford Divines could be compared with their quotation from St. Thomas Aquinas, it would be impossible to discover between them the least degree whatever of resemblance, far less of identity. And, again, if it be admitted that there is no mistake in the statement, with regard to the alleged distinction being a subject of dispute at the Council, it is inconceivable to us how, under any circumstances of the case, it could be adduced as an argument in favor of the boasted idiosincrasy of the Oxford doctrine.

That there is a difference between faith, and hope, and charity, considered as exercises or diverse operations of the same justifying principle, is evident, and would not, we think, be made the subject of dispute at any time; and we cannot imagine how they ever should be held, by Catholic divines, not to be inward gifts or graces of the same one Spirit, in the unity of the same Christian faith, or purifying righteousness. At all events, the decree of

* Mr. Newman, moreover, in his lectures (p. 159,) distinctly says that the justifying righteousness is "not *of us*, nor *in us*," nor "*any quality or act of our minds*."

In No. 71, also, of Tracts for the Times, in support of this view, an extract is given from Annati, stating that, in the Church of Rome, "it is not de fide (or an article of faith) that justifying righteousness is a habit or *quality*" of the justified man.

the Council of Trent is, as we have seen, explicit and definitive on this very point; and we confess we cannot, again, understand the meaning of Mr. Newman, when he says, "on all which accounts, it (i. e. the alleged distinction) was left unsettled by the Fathers there assembled."

The fact, also, is plain that, in the Catholic Church, the one justifying righteousness of the Christian faith is altogether a distinct thing from the external and absolute righteousness of Jesus Christ in the substance, or essential attribute of his Divinity. For this, it is most certain, can never, according to the Roman faith, be imputed to man, or to any creature, under any circumstances, or in any possible manner whatever.

In relation, moreover, to the matter of the decrees on justifying grace, we add, in the language of Bossuet, that "what was said in the Council of Trent is nothing but a repetition of the Council of Carthage, whose decrees appeared by so much the more inviolable to the Fathers at Trent, as the Fathers of Carthage were sensible in proposing them, they proposed nothing else on this subject but what 'had always been approved of in the Catholic Church spread over the entire earth.'"*

We find, however, in Hooker's celebrated discourse on Justification, a quotation made by him from St. Thomas Aquinas, as an authority for the doctrine of the Church of Rome on the principle of justifying righteousness. The passage runs as follows:—

"Gratia faciens gratum id est justificans, est in anima quiddam reale et positivum, qualitas quædam (art. ii. conc.) supernaturalis, *non eadem cum virtute infusa*, ut magister; sed aliquid (art. ii.) præter virtutes infusas, fidem, spem, charitatem, habitudo quædam (art. ii. ad. 3,) quæ præsupponitur in virtutibus istis, sicut earum principium et radix; essentiam animæ tanquam subjectum occupat, non potentias sed ab ipsa (art. iv. ad. 1,) effluunt virtutes in potentias animæ, per quas potentiæ moventur ad actus."—*St. Th. Aquinas*, 1, 2, quæst. 110.†

In the above, St. Thomas is said to have differed from the distinguished Lombard, and we think it cannot be

* History of the Variations, &c., Book xv. § 143.
† Hooker on Justification, § 5.

denied that there is (as it reads) no small degree of obscurity in the alleged statement of the former. Of this, however, we are certain, that the opinion attributed to him is not the doctrine of the Church, which decides, as Lombard is said to have held, viz., that the justifying grace is substantially the same with the infused virtue. But the statement, as we have before remarked, although differing from the decisions of the Church, has no affinity whatever with the professed distinction of the Oxford Divinity, however desirous its advocates may be to claim the authority of St. Thomas in their behalf. Nothing, again, can be plainer, or more certain, than that the latter never intended to hold the Oxford doctrine of two distinct Christian righteousnesses, which is emphatically the prominent distinction, both of their system and that of Hooker, who undoubtedly did not quote St. Thomas to show an identity with his own doctrine, that "there be," as he says, "two kinds of Christian righteousness," in contradistinction from the one kind of the Catholic Church, and which, moreover, he calls *the very essence of Romanism, and the filthy rags of a corrupted self-righteousness.*

As *we* can find no parallel whatever, in the above-cited passage from St. Thomas, or in any Catholic writer that we have met with, to the singular and peculiar distinction of the Oxford Divinity on the doctrine of our salvation, we must seek for it only in the explanations of their own reasonings on this remarkable feature of their novel and *professedly intermediate* system.*

* St. Hilary, in speaking of the Arians, thus observes, "When once they began to make new confessions of faith, belief became *the creed of the times*, (!) rather than of the gospels. Every year new creeds were made, and men did not keep to that simplicity of faith which they professed at their baptism. And then what miseries ensued! For soon there were as many creeds as might please each party; *tot nunc fides existere, quot voluntates;* and nothing else has been minded, since the Council of Nice, but this creed-making. New creeds have come forth every year and every month. They have been changed, have been anathematized, and then re-established; and thus by too much inquiring into the faith there is no faith left. Recollect that there is not one of thy heretics who does not now assert, that all his errors are derived from the Scriptures. They all urge the Scriptures without any knowledge of them, and without faith, talk of their faith. For it is not

Mr. Newman, therefore, in support of this striking distinction of the Oxford theology between justification and sanctification, strenuously maintains that the former is "not faith, not holiness, not renovation, not obedience, not renewal, or the principle of renewal," nor any thing, in fact, that is "*cognizable* by man." But were this really so, it is evident it would belong to the class of those secret or hidden things which are the prerogatives alone of the Searcher of Hearts, and that it would be both madness and downright rebellion for us to tread on such forbidden ground. And if, indeed, faith be not cognizable by man, the sooner man gave up all inquiry into its character the better; but it cannot be, for in such a case, no alternative, it is evident, would remain for him, but the depths of a vague and hopeless skepticism. At all events, agreeably to this definition, justification must be something utterly incomprehensible by our finite capacities; and hence, it would be, at least, a useless and unavailable task for man to attempt the conception of its meaning. But notwithstanding this impossibility, according to the Oxford doctrine, of man's ever attaining to the knowledge of justification, still it is, agreeably to Mr. Newman, "a certain divine gift, in which all the qualifications of 'faith,' 'holiness,' 'renovation,' &c., are included."*

Dr. Pusey says that he, and all the members of his school, "*exclude* sanctification from having any place in our justification." Mr. Newman, however, as appears from the above, expressly *includes* in it, among other "qualifications," those of "holiness and renovation;" but still, he says, it is "not *renewal*, or the principle of renewal,† but perfectly distinct from renewal, with which Romanists identify it." Hence, according to Mr. N., their capital error of making the two graces to consist only in one Christian righteousness instead of two, "in which he conceives to lie the *unity* (!) of the Catholic doctrine, and which, although he expressly and truly says it is "not the Roman,"‡ he also states "is nevertheless *allowed* (!) in the Church of Rome." (!)

by reading, but by comprehending their sense, that the Scriptures should be weighed."—*Ad Constant.*, L. ii. pp. 1227, 1228, 1230.

* Newman's Lect., p. 159. † Ibid, p. 152. ‡ Ibid, p. 152.

"Never," says Vincent of Lerins, "*was* it allowed, never *is* it allowed, never *will* it be allowed, to deliver any doctrine to the Catholic Christian, that has not been received; and it ever has been, is, and ever will be, a duty to anathematize those *who introduce any novelty.* Who, therefore, shall dare to preach what he has not received? Who shall show himself so easy of belief, as to admit what the Church has not delivered? So taught the great Apostle. But I hear some vain men cry, and cry to Catholics: 'under our authority, our rule, our exposition, condemn what you held, take up that which you condemned, reject your ancient belief, the doctrines of your fathers, the institutes of your elders, and embrace' —what? I shudder to utter it."*

However, it would appear, from the above statement of Mr. Newman, that although "*renovation*" is included among the qualifications of "a certain divine gift," (which he very properly terms justification,) still "renewal, or the principle of renewal," is *not;* since this, in the statement of Dr. Pusey, is expressly *excluded* "from having any place in it."

Mr. Newman, again, argues as follows: "If we say that justification consists in a *supernatural* quality imparted to the soul by God's grace, as the Romanists say, then, in like manner, the question arises, is this quality *all* that is in us of heaven?"† Unquestionably it is, we answer; for what more can man desire than this supernatural gift from heaven, which cometh down from the Father of lights, through the sacrifice of his Son, and the ministration of the Holy Ghost? What more than such a divine property of God in Christ could satisfy the wants of the creature aspiring after the perfections of heaven? According to the Church of Rome, it is a *supernatural* quality which belongs to our immaculate Redeemer himself, which he also purchased for us by the gift of his own life; and is, also, in a word, the *substance* of every good and every perfect gift which is bestowed by God upon all his faithful creatures.

It is not, to be sure, the *absolute* righteousness of God

* Commonit. I. n. ix. p. 328.
† Newman's Lectures, p. 150.

alone, which, it is most certain, can never be a heavenly gift in us, but which is, nevertheless, accounted to the creature, by the doctrine of Oxford, and by every other that dissents from the Church of Rome. Nor is it, on the other hand, a *mere* quality of the creature alone, which it certainly would be, were it, indeed, *our own* righteousness; and in which our sanctification is, by *all* Protestants, made to consist; but it is no other than the justifying property and righteousness of God, by faith in Jesus Christ, working in the hearts and lives of all his renewed members.

In conformity with the above, we cite, in our behalf, a part of the above quotation from St. Thomas Aquinas, as speaking the very doctrine of the Church on this point, and whom the Oxford Divines, as we have seen, most strangely claim as an authority for *their own* most singular and confused distinction of two Christian righteousnesses instead of one. "Gratia gratum faciens," says St. Thomas, "id est justificans est in anima quiddam reale et positivum, qualitas quædam *supernaturalis*." It is certainly very evident that the justifying or acceptable grace here spoken of, is altogether a very different thing either from the "*absolute* acceptableness" of the Oxford school, on the one hand, or "the *beginnings* of their inherent acceptableness," on the other; and that, however they may claim an affinity with the distinction of St. Thomas, it is by no means a distinction like theirs, between a justifying righteousness which they term perfect, and a sanctifying one which they call *imperfect*.

As we have before observed, it is stated in Tract No. 71, "that in Romanism, it is *de fide* that man is justified by inherent righteousness; it is not *de fide* that justifying righteousness is a *habit or quality*. Whether this be intended or not, by the Oxford Divines, as an authority in favor of their own distinctive doctrine of justifying righteousness, we presume not to decide. Still, however, they say that Roman writers make this a quality of the mind, and thus identify it with sanctification, from which *they* dissent. At the same time, it is stated by them, that their distinction is *allowed in the Church of Rome*; (!) but whether this inference is drawn from the above statement, that "it is not *de fide* that justifying righteousness

is a habit or quality," appears to us, at least, somewhat difficult to determine. With regard to this latter part of the statement, we will detain our readers no further than by saying, it is evident, from what we have already remarked, that it is, unquestionably, *de fide* to hold it as a *supernatural* quality, since it is the spiritual property of a supernatural *substance ;* but that it is *not de fide*, to hold it as a mere natural property of the creature, which would, indeed, be a notion directly at variance with the faith of the Church, as well as repugnant to the true reason of man.

Again, in order to show or explain the peculiar nature of their distinction between justification and renewal, Mr. Newman says it is "the presence of the Holy Ghost shed abroad in our hearts," in contradistinction from "*our* righteousness, which is the possession of that presence." The former, also, it is maintained, is not ours, notwithstanding it is held to be our justification ; but, nevertheless, neither our renewal, nor faith, nor any property whatever of our minds ; being, in short, a mysterious something, which, in fact, is "not any thing cognizable by man ;" but which, as it appears to us, is really nothing else than a mere visionary abstraction, incapable of a clear or intelligible definition.

But we beg our readers to understand, that it is not "the presence of the Holy Ghost shed abroad in our hearts," which we count as the imaginary conceit—God forbid the indulgence of such a thought—but it is the vain doctrine that this presence, which is held to be our justification, should be said to exist "within us," and even to be shed abroad in our hearts, and, at the same time, be no property of ours ; nor yet, "not of us, or in us," and altogether distinct from faith, from obedience, from "renewal, or the principle of renewal," and, in short, from sanctification itself, and all the concomitant graces of that divine and sacred operation !

This distinction, in fact, of the Oxford theology, is nothing more than an imputation to us of a something which has no existence whatever, save in the imaginary device of their own *via media*, or intermediate system between the Protestant and Catholic faith ; and which,

like other shadows, is destined soon to pass away, and be numbered with the years beyond the flood.

"What," says Vincent of Lerins, "mean those words to Timothy (1 Tim. vi. 20,)—'Keep that which is committed to thy trust?' They mean that which was intrusted to thee, not what was invented by thee; what thou didst receive, not what thou didst devise; a thing, not of ingenuity, but of doctrine; not of private science, but of public delivery: brought to thee, not arising from thee; a thing, of which thou must be the guardian, not the author: the disciple, not the master: the follower, not the leader. What was intrusted to thee, that retain, that deliver. Thou hast received gold; thou must return gold, no base metal, no counterfeit. Oh, Timothy! if the divine bounty hath given thee the capacity, use it to polish the precious gems of the Divine Word, to arrange them with fidelity, with skill to embellish them; give them splendor, grace, and beauty: what before, though involved in some obscurity, was believed, whilst thou expoundest, be it more clearly understood. Posterity, to thee indebted, may behold in a brighter day, what their fathers venerated in obscurity; but teach what alone thou didst learn; that, while *the expression may be new, the thing said be ancient.*"*

But if the Oxford Divines mean to account to us the presence of the Holy Ghost, in the same way as other Protestants account to us the absolute righteousness of Jesus Christ, and to hold that it is not the faith or gift of Christ, in his living members, that is imputed to them for justification, then, we can only say, that their doctrine affords but another melancholy and deplorable instance of abuse, in regard to the two fundamental dogmas of the Christian religion. For, in the first place, it keeps not the Unity of the Godhead, as distinguished from the Trinity of its Persons; and, in the next, it confounds the attributes which belong to the Creator alone, with the gifts which he bestows upon the offspring of his new creation.

If the Oxford writers, therefore, insist upon holding, that our justification is neither faith, nor renewal, nor

* Commonit. I. n. xxii. p. 350.

holiness, but "the presence of the Holy Ghost shed abroad in our hearts," who is "the author both of faith and of renewal;" what is this but the holding of a doctrine that he has a presence "within us," which they distinguish from his inherent presence in the righteousness or unity of justifying faith, and in the substance of our Lord's incarnate body and its creature members? But if they intend not to hold such a doctrine, how, we ask, can they possibly avoid its imputation, as long as they maintain their extraordinary distinction that "the presence of the Holy Ghost, the author both of faith and renewal," is the "justifying principle within us,"* but yet, "not any quality or act of our minds," nor even faith itself, nor holiness, nor, in short, any thing cognizable by man?† Now this is, indeed, the very opposite of the Catholic and Roman faith, which has ever held the uncreated and consubstantial unity of the Triune God, in perfect and inviolate distinction from the created substance and unity of our Lord's humanity: a distinction which can never be denied without a flagrant impeachment, at once of the doctrine of the Trinity, and of the doctrine of the Incarnation. For, with equal propriety, might we hold a conversion of the Godhead into flesh, as to maintain a presence of the Holy Ghost within us, apart from the infused and mediatorial principle of his justifying and sanctifying faith. And as well, also, might we maintain that, since God in Christ is the author of truth in man, that, therefore, he is *not* truth; or because he is the sole source of our spiritual life and light, that, therefore, he is *not* "the way, the truth, and the life!"

The Oxford writers, in like manner, and with equal consistency, while they admit that "the only true justification is the being *made* holy or renewed," yet insist that this *very* circumstance implies that holiness or renewal was *not* the same as justification, but *perfectly distinct* from it, and "with which," they say, "Romanists identify it," and therein, as they also allege, make this one of the principal, if not the chief error, in what they call their corrupt and fallen Church.‡

* Lectures, pp. 150, 151. † Ibid, p. 159.

‡ "The trite phrase, the *horrible corruptions* of the Catholic Church, does not, in the most remote degree, affect the general

Were the Oxford Di vines fully sensible of the imperious necessity as well as the divine character of apostolic and Catholic tradition on the right meaning of the Inspired Volume, it is very evident they could not have embraced the egregious errors which characterize their peculiar doctrine on the unity of Christian justice. The following counsel, therefore, of Vincent de Lerins, cannot be too frequently impressed upon the minds of all who profess the Christian faith.

"If I, or any other person," he says, "would detect the errors of heresy, avoid its snares, and stand steadfast in the true faith, we must ground ourselves on two principles—*the authority of the Scriptures, and the tradition of the Catholic Church.** But some perhaps may ask:—The canon of the holy books being perfect, and more than sufficient for itself, why should the authority of the Church be joined to it? I answer: Because the Scripture, having a sublime sense, is differently expounded. By one person it is interpreted in one sense, by a second in another sense: so that there are *almost as many opinions about its meaning, as there are persons.* Novatian, Sabellius, Donatus, Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinaris, Priscillian, Jovinianus, Pelagius, Celestius, and finally Nestorius, admit no common interpretation. It is, therefore, *wholly necessary*, on account of so many subtle evasions, *to take the sense of the Catholic Church for our rule.*"†

controversy, such as it is at the present day. You admit that if the independence of individual reason were once established as a principle, the total ruin of Christianity would be the result. Then you must also admit, that Christianity cannot uphold itself but in virtue of the Catholic principle of *authority*, or you must *invent* some principle of belief which will *be neither the Catholic or Protestant* principle, (according to the profession of the Oxford school,) and you will be good enough to mark the absurdity. If the thirty-nine articles of the English Church are to be believed, in virtue of private judgment, you revert to the system which you have declared incompatible with the existence of Christianity. If, on the contrary, the English Church contends that they are to be adopted on her authority, she sports with human reason: whereas she owes *her existence to the private judgment of the Reformers* opposed to the authority of the Catholic Church."—*Gerbet on the Eucharist*, p. 204.

* Common. n. ii. p. 316. † Ibid, p. 317.

It seems to us that, while the Oxford writers would appear sensible of error, in the *prevailing* system of the Protestant distinction of two Christian righteousnesses, that they are, themselves, still unaware of the necessary and indispensable unity of a Catholic righteousness, which, while it includes, in its supernatural gift, the substance of all the various graces of the Christian calling, offers no violence to the essence of the incomprehensible Trinity; but ascribes undivided praise to the majesty of the Godhead, for his infinite condescension in taking to himself our nature, in order to bestow it upon us again, in a new and brighter image than that of the first and earthly man, through the astonishing sacrifice of his own body in the righteousness of faith, and in the unity of its indivisible spiritual and now glorified substance.

On this account, they still pursue the vain and delusive shadow of a double, or two-fold principle, which, under whatever variety of form it may appear, will never conduct its followers to the simplicity of Catholic truth. The true principle is to be sought and found nowhere but in the Church of Rome. Within her sacred walls, alone, has the ancient faith, which was once delivered by its Author, been kept unchangeable and pure as the heavenly source from which it came.

"Why, then," says Vincent of Lerins, "it may be said, is the Church of Christ to make no advance, no proficiency, in religious knowledge? God forbid! Let intellect, science, wisdom, in all orders of men, and in all ages, receive every possible increase; but without any change in the dogma, in its sense, in its acceptation." This he illustrates from the growth of the human body, which, through all its changes, from childhood to manhood, retains its identity, and then adds: "So may the dogma of Christian belief follow the same laws of increase; be expanded by age, be consolidated by years; itself ever remaining unchanged and untouched; full and perfect in all its parts and members, without any admixture, any loss of substance, any variation of meaning."*

* Common. n. xxiii. pp. 351, 352.

Here only, then, in the Roman Church, can we find the knowledge of that certain gift, which, while it may, indeed, be cognizable by all men, includes within itself all the various graces of the Christian calling. This truly is that perfect and mysterious boon which proves that Jesus Christ is its author and finisher, alike by its reverence for the substance of the Godhead, and its sacred regard for the unity of its righteousness in the person of our Lord, and in the members of his risen and supernatural body.

It is the Catholic Church of Rome, only, which declares that his obedience in us is unquestionably *the same* as that which he once rendered in his body unto death; but, then, how unlike, how different *the manner*, in which the Church ascribes it to her *Lord*, from that in which she ascribes it to his meek and humble *followers!* She tells us that by him it was accomplished in a mode altogether peculiar to himself alone, or in a manner exclusively his own, and which it was not possible for any other being to render. By imputing it, then, to the creature, in this way, it leads us, of necessity, to a system of downright Pantheism, inasmuch as it counts the race of man to be equal to his Creator, and thus identifies the derived gifts and properties of the creature, with the absolute and self-existing attributes of Omnipotence. It is plain, moreover, that there is no conceivable mode in which the ingenuity of man can sever the unity of Christian righteousness, without confounding, at the same time, the identity of the creature itself with the identity of him by whom it was made and formed.* Most surely,

* The various systems of Rationalism, so called, which now prevail on the continent of Europe, most strikingly evince the endless forms of error, and "confusion worse confounded," which owe their birth, progress, and development, to this selfsame principle of severance on the nature of Christian righteousness, which has thus formed the subject matter of our present inquiry. We have, moreover, no hesitation in affirming, that if the visionary hypothesis of our justification by "two righteousnesses," whether as held by Protestants in general, or by the Oxford school in particular, be fairly carried out to its real and logical consequences, it will be found in principle, no better than the superstitious Pantheism of German mystics, or the heartless skepticism of Hume.

In a work recently published on the state of the Protestant religion in Germany, Mr. Hugh James Rose, a minister of the En-

also, does the sad experience of the last three hundred years confirm the truth of the above position, by demon-

glish Church, has forcibly pointed out these results of anti-Catholic imputation, as exhibited in the systems of so-called Rationalism :—" The doctrines of the innovators must have shocked and afflicted all who as yet were sincerely attached to Christianity. But as the churches of Germany wanted both a common centre, and a fixed doctrine, the friends of religion nowhere found a rallying point. Each one was obliged to adopt the plan of defence which appeared to him best calculated to uphold the good cause ; and though many theologians, and especially Storr, displayed great zeal in the defence of the orthodox doctrine, it appears that the majority of those who are ranked among the antagonists of rationalism, fearing that they could not maintain the ancient system in its various parts, wisely judged that more evil and good would result from a continuation of the controversy. Owing to these apprehensions, many laid down the weapons of reason, took refuge in their own thoughts, and closing their eyes on the exterior world, where every thing scandalized and afflicted them, they betook themselves to contemplation, in order to attain to a union with God, the immediate vision of the truths of faith, which has always been the end of mysticism. For when we presume too much on human reason, we generally end by despairing in it. This tendency to mysticism was kept up among the common people by various religious tracts, some of which were the result of native talent, others imported into Germany.

" The Protestant principle, generalized by philosophy, and applied to the basis of human science, has been productive of similar results. If on the one hand it begets, by its peculiar action, skepticism, on the other, it leads to mysticism the minds in which this *rational* destruction of faith is combined with the *want* of some sort of faith.

" A similar tendency," continues Mr. Rose, " resulted from the philosophy of the day of the higher orders. Three systems of philosophy have successively reigned in Germany, and even still they contend there for the empire of the mind. The two first, those of Kant and Fichte, are preparing the way for mysticism ; at least, inasmuch as they reject all objective proofs of religion, and substitute for them others more subjective. I do not mean to insinuate that it was the intention of these two philosophers to lead the mind to mysticism ; but the principles established by them lead indirectly to it. In refusing to believe that human reason can establish the existence of God and the intellectual world, and admitting as the basis of these truths but a practical faith rendered necessary by our moral constitution, Kant would have us seek truth only in the investigation of this practical principle, which is said to be inherent to our nature.

" Now who does not perceive that such an abstraction of the exterior world in the research of truth, presents a striking resemblance with the operations of mysticism, which are equally internal. Besides, if reason has not the right to place an intelligent

strating to the world at large, the utter impotency of man, in putting asunder the things which God hath joined to-

author over this beautiful spectacle of the heavens and the earth, imagination and sentiment will do it against reason; and that such an important truth should depend solely on their authority, would appear to me a further advance to mysticism. However, if Kant states that we know nothing of God, at least he makes a distinction between God and the world. Fichte does not stop even here, for he says what we denominate Providence and moral order, has not an existence distinct from our moral nature. In whatever light we view the charge of atheism, preferred against the author of this doctrine, it is evident that such a system tends to mysticism; whereas he admits so intimate and essential a union of the soul with God, that it would be impossible to conceive the existence of God independent of our moral nature. But if mysticism is only a consequence more or less direct of the two first systems, it may be regarded as the basis of the third, viz., that of Schelling.

"Though agreeing with Kant as to the impotence of reason, he rejects the consequence drawn by him, viz., that we have no knowledge of the intellectual world; and he maintains that we can arrive at that knowledge, not through the medium of reasoning, but by the shorter path of *intuition*. In his system, God is the only existing being; he is both the unity and totality of all that exists: whatever is said to exist independently of him, has no real existence; even we do not exist ourselves really. What is termed our individual, personal existence, is but a mere phantom, for our reality results from our identity with God. This system, to which we have alluded only to point out its close relation to mysticism, representing God as the absolute being, independently of whom nothing exists, and by the very fact teaching the identity of many things that appear to have a separate existence, cannot derive its proofs either from reason or the senses, which, so far from favoring such a doctrine, proclaim the very contrary.

"It became necessary, then, to evoke a power which could raise us above the sphere of experience, a faculty calculated to transform into truth and reality what reason and the senses declared to be impossible and false. What is this power, this faculty? It is the *intuition* of the *absolute*; in other words, an imagination, soaring above the regions of poetical genius, which in its inventions should never go beyond what reason and the senses can admit, at least as possible. In consequence of these principles, great importance was attached to whatever could nourish or excite the imagination, as well as to the impressions that might be produced from acting on the senses. There are some among the disciples of Schelling, who bitterly lament the coldness of Protestant worship, exhort the preachers to address themselves solely to the senses and imagination. Not a few authors of that school regret even the pomp of paganism.

"The Catholic religion has been also complimented; many have openly given up Protestantism, whilst others desire to introduce a portion of the Catholic ceremonies into the reformed worship.

gether, and by establishing the incomparable wisdom of the Church, who testifies *to the essential oneness* of her faith, "as strong as proof from Holy Writ."

Her doctrine, also, on the Eucharist, most strikingly illustrates the truth of our positions, by showing us, in like manner, the identity of its sacrifice with that of Calvary; and that while he once offered himself alone unto death, he now makes the same oblation at the hands of his consecrated ministers, in the unbloody and sacramental forms of bread and wine. For as the regenerating obedience of Christ is the same now as it was in the days of his flesh, so is the sacrifice, which he once offered on the wood of the Cross, the identical sacrifice on the Christian Altar, as made, worshipped, and adored in the Church of the Living God, which is spread in every nation of the world.

While the absolute righteousness of Jesus Christ, in connection with another of our own, is made, in the Oxford system, to be their *two formal causes* of justification, (although baptism is held to be "the sole outward" one!) so is it also held that there are two instrumental causes of the same, of which baptism is said to be "the sole outward" one, and faith "the sole inward" one.

DR. PUSEY.

As Mr. Newman appears to have devoted more labor to the exposition of the two formal causes, and the nature

"Some of the disciples of Schelling profess what may be termed an allegorical Catholicism. They make use of a Catholic nomenclature in the exposition of their master's system, as well as in speaking of the sacrifice and priesthood of the Christian religion; but the sense they attach to these orthodox expressions, bear no affinity whatsoever to their ordinary and natural signification. It is not, however, to be supposed that all the changes which have taken place with regard to religion in Germany, are to be ascribed to this philosophical mysticism. Many proselytes, in entering the pale of a Church, which, in the midst of her horrible corruption, has preserved at least the form and principal doctrines of a true Church, seek there that peace which they had in vain sought amidst the interminable changes of the Protestant Church of Germany, and by the successive rejection of all the truths of Christianity."—*Vide the Catholic Memorial, January*, 1829.

of the "inward instrument," Dr. Pusey, it would seem, has bestowed his attention chiefly upon the illustration of the "sole outward one."

According to the distinctions, however, of Oxford imputation, the justifying grace, or salvation of man, is, by Dr. Pusey, limited only to the sacrament of baptism, or, as it is termed in the system, "the *alone outward* instrument" of our justification. Here, then, is another characteristic of their own peculiar *via media* between Protestantism on the one hand, and the Church of Rome on the other. While the great majority, moreover, of Protestant societies,* on their own narrow systems of accounted righteousness, limit the salvation of man to a mere outward imputation of "historical" and "physical" faith, and the Oxford school restrict their saving faith to a mere reception alone of the sacrament of baptism, the calumniated Church of Rome, founded as she is on the everlasting rock of charity, teaches that all men, whether Pagan, Jew, or Gentile, who do, in sincerity, and from the heart, obey the will of God, and to whom there may be invincible obstacles to a reception of the Christian sacraments, will, nevertheless, be judged *according to their works;* and if acceptable, be unquestionably saved by the justice of God in Jesus Christ; but yet not without the inward application of its merits to them, as new-born creatures, in the grace and sanctifying virtues of another life.

But, on the other hand, the system of Protestant imputation must, of necessity, on its own contracted and acknowledged principle of judgment, consign the far greater part of our race to a *necessary and inevitable* perdition. For with the advocates of this doctrine, the *mere* imputation only of the righteousness of Jesus Christ, is necessarily connected with the certain belief, that by this, and this alone, we are qualified for *future* sanctification in this life, and final salvation in the next. Now, as the heathen have no historical knowledge of the obedience

* From which, however, we are bound in courtesy to exclude our Oxford opponents, inasmuch as they repudiate the *name*, and prefer a Catholic one in its place; though we cannot, consistently, allow them the latter, save in name *only*, for charity forbids the application in spirit and in truth.

which Christ rendered on earth in the days of his flesh, and, of course, can have *no possibility of such a belief* as the creed of a legal imputation requires, it would be difficult, or rather impracticable, in consistency with its articles, to cherish the faintest hopes in regard to their future and everlasting destiny. While some, therefore, among the sects, consign the heathen, after the phraseology of this merciless code, to "God's uncovenanted mercies," as they are styled, others again, with perhaps more logical fidelity to their system, stoutly deny all hope of their redemption from the curse, and the consequent possibility of their eternal salvation.

While the expositions of Mr. Newman are more particularly distinguished by their zealous endeavor to break the unity of Christian justice into two distinct and separate principles, those of Dr. Pusey are characterized, in a special manner, by his equally vain attempt to maintain an unheard of unity between the lifeless belief of hardened offenders, and the incipient faith of an humble penitent. We have already seen, in the reasoning of the former, how the peculiarity of the Oxford system, in its doctrine of the two righteousnesses, confounds the essential justice of our Lord's personal divinity with the inwrought justice of his living members. It now remains for us to see how Dr. Pusey, on his part, confounds the living and formed faith of the penitent catechumen, with the barren conviction which demons have of his Almighty power and justice. With him, the virtues of hope and love, which precede and prepare for the reception of the sacrament, are, of necessity, withheld, in order to be then, and only then, communicated; and that, too, for the sole purpose of vivifying the *dead faith* which the Via Media of his school gives to every recipient of baptism, before the application of its regenerating laver and the impression of its sacramental character.

While the Church of Rome allows the validity of baptism even to those who are separated from her communion, the Oxford writers, on the contrary, admit the same only when performed by the clergy of their own Church —saving the one, however, through which they vainly endeavor to show the apostolic commission under which they profess to discharge its functions.

On the other hand, the Catholic Church holds, that the very dispositions which she requires for the due reception (in adults) of the sacrament, necessarily consist, in measure, of the very principle itself of the divine gift, whose graces are increased and perfected through the supernatural efficacy of the regenerating sacrament. She teaches that, although the sincere penitent is, in effect, previously renewed by the inward and imparted form of divine justice, he is, nevertheless, purified through the Word of the Sacrament, and the instrumental virtue of its living waters. "Two effects," says St. Thomas Aquinas, "are produced in the soul by baptism: namely, sacramental character and grace. Any thing may be necessary for baptism in two ways. In one sense, that is necessary, without which grace, which is the last effect of the sacrament, cannot be had: and in this way, correct faith is required, of necessity, for baptism; because, as it is said in Romans iii., 'The justice of God is through the faith of Jesus Christ.' In another way, that is necessarily required for baptism, without which the baptismal character cannot be impressed. And in this sense, the correct faith of the baptized person is not required of necessity for baptism, as not even the correct faith of him who baptizes, provided the other things be had which are of necessity for the sacrament. For the sacrament is not perfected by the (mere) justice of the giver or receiver, but by the power of God."*. "As the sacrament of baptism should not be conferred on him who will not forsake other sins, so neither should it be administered to him who will not abandon infidelity. Both, however, receive the sacrament, if it be administered to them, *although not to their salvation*."†

"Thus, then, the dispositions for baptism," in the language of Bishop Kenrick, "are an unreserved faith in all the revealed truths, and a sincere sorrow for having offended God. The candidate may conceive this sorrow

* St. Thomas, Summa. p. 3, qu. 68, art. 8, ad. 3.

† Ibidem, ad. 4. As Dr. Pusey, however, teaches that correct and sound faith is not, according to his school, essential to the living virtue of the sacrament, he must, on the other hand, necessarily admit that *both* receive the baptismal ordinance to their salvation.

from *the most perfect motives:* and provided it be supernatural and efficacious, he may approach the sacrament with confidence in the mercy of our Saviour God, who will complete *the good work he has begun*, and breathe his holy love into the soul, and glorify his power in this new creation. What is there wanting in this doctrine to excite man to purity of life, and vindicate the attributes of God?"*

The Church of Rome teaches, moreover, that while baptism is the instrument or means by which the merit of the atonement is applied to the believer, *the justice of God is the only formal* cause whereby the grace of the sacrament is made perfect or accomplished. In this she carefully distinguishes between the required disposition or grace of the adult, and the outward means whereby these justifying gifts are secretly imparted and increased. She teaches that the merit of this renewed condition was procured for us only by the obedience, passion, and death of our Lord upon the Cross, and that no one was ever justified, under any dispensation, or at any time whatever, unless the living faith of God was actually infused and formed in his heart. An instrumental cause of justification, says the Holy Synod of Trent, "is the sacrament of baptism, which is the sacrament of faith, without which (faith) no one was ever justified."†

Now, if Abel, Noah, Abraham, David, and others, under the economy of former days, obtained their justification through this same supernatural and inwrought gift of God, how will Dr. Pusey reconcile these facts with the peculiar theory of his school, that the sacrament of baptism is the *only* source of man's justification? It is impossible to deny that these above-named servants of God, in their approved faith, embraced *all in substance*, that we adore, as finished upon the Cross by our blessed Lord, and therefore we must admit that they also partook of his obedience and received its sanctifying merits. But while the justified Christian participates in the same, they are, however, imparted to him in a manner which, of neces-

* The Catholic Doctrine on Justification, by Bishop F. P. Kenrick, p. 139.

† Sess. vi. Cap. vii.

sity, was denied to the ancient patriarchs. To the former belongs the exalted privilege of enjoying them, even during his present state of temporal pilgrimage, in an increased measure through the consecrated fulness of the Christian sacraments, of which the old and abrogated rites of other days were nothing in themselves but the mere passing forms and empty shadows.

This very doctrine, however, of the Oxford school, that the faith of all men is, of necessity, dead before their reception of the sacrament of baptism, and from which it would follow that none could possibly be saved who had not received it, is one of the ordinary reproaches and calumnies against the Catholic Church.* While the former, also, teach that baptism is the only sacrament of our justification, they hold, moreover, that none can receive this justifying gift without the sacrament, under any circumstances,—not even such, indeed, as may humbly desire it, or thirst after its living waters.

In consistency, also, with their fundamental distinction between justification and sanctification, and on which they ground their "doctrine of the two righteousnesses," Dr. Pusey maintains that even Cornelius the centurion was not regenerated or justified before his actual reception of the sacrament of baptism. The sacred text, however, describes him as being, before that period, "a just man," and "one that feared God with all his house, who gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God

* Bishop McIlvaine, in his work on "Oxford Divinity," (p. 213,) affirms that the Church of Rome maintains the absolute necessity of *the sacrament* of baptism, in such a sense, that without *it* (i. e. the sacrament,) justification can be obtained by none. In support of this assertion, he cites a misquoted passage from the decisions of the Council of Trent, in the following form: "Instrumentalis causa—sacramentum baptismi sine QUO nulli unquam justificatio contingit."—*Consil. Trident. Sess.* vi. In referring, however, to an authentic copy of the decrees, the reader will find the text to run as follows: "Instrumentalis item, sacramentum baptismi; *quod est sacramentum fidei* (omitted in the above quotation,) sine QUA (relating to fides, and not to sacramentum,) nulli unquam contingit justificatio." It is most evident, therefore, that the Church of Rome does *not* deny salvation to all who have it not in their power to receive the sacrament. The Scriptures are conclusive on this point, in the case of Cornelius and his family, who received the Holy Spirit of baptism prior to their reception of the same in the consecrated water of the sacrament.

always."* And although Dr. Pusey is constrained to admit that he and his family received the Holy Ghost whilst Peter was yet speaking to them, still he maintains that they were, even in that state, void of living faith; and, although not then really justified, that they were, nevertheless, partly, or in a measure, sanctified.

Now, according to the unity of the Roman faith, we may, or rather must believe, that others, also, in like manner, may receive the grace of the Holy Spirit in their hearts, be truly justified before the actual reception of the sacrament, and by anticipation possess its living faith through the virtuous desire of their hearts, whilst in their subsequent reception of the holy sign, the same grace is conferred upon them in larger measure, and in more abundant fruitfulness.

Where, then, is the inconsistency of our believing in the necessity of baptism for salvation, which was so emphatically declared by the Council of Trent, and which anathematized "whosoever shall say that baptism is free, that is, not necessary for salvation?"† And who, moreover, is justly responsible for the erroneous assumption or belief that the Catholic Church teaches there is no possible justification to any one without the sacrament of faith, and that she positively denies salvation to all who receive not the regenerating laver? In her divine exposition of the Christian doctrine, on this topic, the same Council infallibly declares, that "Since the gospel has been promulgated, the translation" (from the state in which we are born to the state of grace) "cannot take place without the laver of regeneration, *or its desire:* as it is written, 'Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."‡

With this most plain and unambiguous interpretation, therefore, before them, how can men presume to make the reproach we have alluded to against the Catholic Church, when she so clearly reveals to us that there is salvation to such as desire the water of baptism, when circumstances may unavoidably be such as to prevent

* Acts x. 2, 22.
† Sess. vii. Can. v. De Baptismo.
‡ Sess. vi. Cap. iv. De Justif.

their actual reception of this most holy and most necessary sacrament of justifying and regenerating faith!

Since there are, again, according to the Oxford Divines, two *formal* causes of our justification, so, in like manner, do they support two *instrumental* causes of the same. This latter classification, moreover, is effected, in their system, by denominating one an outward, and the other an *inward instrument!* thus holding *baptism alone* for the former, and *faith alone* for the latter. In this we also trace their cardinal principle of severance against the unity of Catholic faith; and this, moreover, by their most strange and incongruous argument, which, while it holds that *baptism alone* justifies, also holds that *faith alone* likewise does the same!

On the other hand, the Catholic Church teaches that, while the unity of baptism justifies only through the power of sanctifying faith, the latter likewise justifies in those who are duly prepared for the sacrament through their desire for the same, when the means for their obtaining it may not be at hand, or within their power.

The views, then, of the Oxford Divines on the subject of baptism, it would appear, are even more extraordinary than their doctrine of justification by two righteousnesses. Their system, indeed, in relation to the above-named sacrament, is so palpably obnoxious to the sense of the Sacred Writings, and so glaringly offensive to the feelings of the whole Christian world, whether Catholic or Protestant, that we think it hardly necessary to detain our readers with any thing more on the subject, than the bare statement of Dr. Pusey's sentiments on the same, in a work which he calls "Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism."

In regard to Cornelius, he says, "It is commonly thought that he, having been miraculously converted, was regenerated, justified by faith, pardoned, had received the Holy Ghost before he was baptized. Not so, however, Holy Scripture, if we consider it attentively: before his baptism he appears neither to have been pardoned, regenerated, justified, nor enlightened. But as yet neither were his sins forgiven, nor had he received the Holy Ghost; much less then was he born again of the

Spirit, before it was conveyed to him through his Saviour's sacrament."*

Now all this is based on that extraordinary and monstrous doctrine to which we have before adverted, viz.: that the faith of all men, before their actual reception of the sacrament, is, of necessity, a dead faith, and no better, nay, in fact, the very same in substance as the faith of demons.

Dr. Pusey teaches, moreover, that as the gift of regeneration, and of the Holy Spirit, cannot be imparted to or received by man, in any other way than by the sacrament of baptism, so, when they have once lost their baptismal gifts through grievous sin, that the Church has no further commission, either to pronounce forgiveness to the offender, or declare a restoration to his former grace. And, strange however as it may appear, he tells us, moreover, that it is more than doubtful that the unhappy man can be thus restored until the day of judgment.

In his endeavor to establish these peculiar views, he gratuitously assumes the unauthorized position that even St. Paul, at the time of his conversion, did not receive, in any degree, the influence or grace of the Holy Spirit. With such premises, he then asks, in a tone of triumph, "If even to St. Paul, for whose conversion our Saviour himself vouchsafed again to become visible to human sight, regeneration, and the other gifts of the Holy Spirit, were not imparted without the appointed sacrament of grace, why should this be expected or looked for by others?" "The case," he continues, "is very remarkable, as indeed one should expect the calling of the father of the Gentile Church to have in it something peculiar, as well as that of the father of the first people of God. Two different points in his history have accordingly been seized upon, and made the Scriptural basis of distinct theories; his previous holiness—of the school *notion* (!) of grace of congruity—the descent of the Holy Ghost previous to his baptism—of the separation of the grace of the sacrament from the ordinance."†

What Dr. Pusey intends by the opinion which he says

* Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism, by Dr. Pusey, p. 174.
† Ibid, pp. 175, 176.

is entertained by others on "*the separation* of the grace of the sacrament from the ordinance," is not our purpose here to investigate. We will, therefore, merely remark on this point, that the *distinction* of the inward grace of the sacrament from its outward sign, is most clearly recognized and enforced in the Catechism of his own Church. These two distinct things are nevertheless perpetually confounded by him in all his extravagant interpretations, while the unity of other things which cannot possibly be separated, are, on the other hand, with equal recklessness, violently torn apart, to the utter perversion of all sober reasoning and apostolic faith.

Thus he also calls the grace of congruity a *mere* "*theory*,"—a "school *notion*,"—in the same way as he would term the formed faith of the penitent catechumen, as expounded by St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas, a mere school notion of papal or Roman *corruption*.*

* "*Our* reformers in the *sixteenth* century," says the writer of Tract No. 41, "did not touch the existing documents of doctrine; there was no occasion; they kept the creeds as they were; but they *added* protests against the *corruptions of faith* which had grown up around them."—*Quoted also by Dr. Pusey in the appendix to his letter.*

How far, and in what manner, the above statement can be reconciled with the evidence of the English Parliament on this subject, we submit to the judgment of the impartial reader, by requesting his attention to the following circumstances.

An act was passed in Edward's reign to empower thirty-two persons to make "a *reformation* of the ecclesiastical laws:"

> "As if religion were intended
> For nothing else but to be mended."

Whether matters of *faith*, or *existing doctrine*, were included in the list of "heresies" referred to, we should suppose it were no difficult task to determine.

On the first of November, 1551, a commission was given to eight persons to prepare the matter for the review of the thirty-two. These eight were the Archbishop of Canterbury, Cranmer, the Bishop of Ely, Dr. Cox, Peter Martyr, Dr. May, Dr. Taylor, &c., (all Reformers.) "I find it said," says Bishop Burnet, "in the preface to the book as it was printed in Queen Elizabeth's reign, that Cranmer did the whole work almost himself. The first title was the Trinity, and the Catholic Faith; in which those who denied the Christian religion, were to suffer death, and the loss of their goods. The second title contains an enumeration of many heresies, viz.: against the Trinity, Jesus Christ, Scriptures, about original sin, *justification*, the mass, purgatory; and censured those

Although St. Paul, according to him, was by no means regenerated before his reception of the sacrament, Cornelius, he admits, was in a measure sanctified prior to his reception of the same. The only reason he gives for this alleged difference between the two cases, is that the latter was "very remarkable," and had "in it something peculiar," as, he says, might naturally be expected in his case. Still, however, he insists that although he "was already in a measure sanctified," he was not yet translated into the kingdom of grace, or actually a member of Christ. Nevertheless, he says, "Cornelius had faith, 'for without faith it is impossible to please God;'" still, according to him, it was neither formed faith, nor "Christian faith, nor love, nor self-denial, *nor prayer!*"* And these he calls "scriptural views of Holy Baptism."

In illustration of his peculiar views of the sacrament, while he confounds, as we have noticed, its sign with its grace, he, of course, separates faith and repentance from the new birth in such a manner as to maintain that, while the former, "in some measure, *may* (!)† depend upon the will of man,"‡ the latter is by no means conditional, but merely an *absolute* and exclusive election of God without the co-operation or free-will of him who is called and regenerated.

Now this doctrine, it must be acknowledged, is certainly no less gross than the monstrous teaching of the Synod of Dort, or that of the Westminster Confession on the nature of the decrees of God. For while Dr. Pusey maintains that the faith of a penitent catechumen, which,

who thought the sacraments naked signs, who denied the baptism of infants, or *thought none could possibly be saved that were not baptized;* or who asserted transubstantiation, &c., from which, and other heresies, all are dissuaded, and earnestly exhorted to endeavor the extirpation of them. The third was about the judgments of heresy, &c.; obstinate heretics were to be declared *infamous, incapable of public trust,* or to be witnesses in any court, or to have power to make a testament, and were *not to have the benefit of the law.*" *&c.—Collier's Eccl. Hist.*, vol. ii. p. 196.

* Notwithstanding it is written that he "prayed to God always," and that his *prayers* and alms had "ascended for a memorial in the sight of God."—Acts x. 2, 4.

† For who can *doubt* that these gifts are most certainly dependent upon the free co-operation of the creature's will?

‡ Script. Views of Holy Baptism, by Dr. Pusey, p. 177.

according to his school, is no better, or rather, in no wise differs from that of the demons, may be baptized into regenerating faith; so, on the other hand, he insists that no piety or holiness, of any kind or degree, can ever be sufficient to admit one among the members of Christ, without the sacrament of baptism. The first position he attempts to prove by the case of St. Paul, and the latter by that of Cornelius. "That so all might see, that neither the abyss of sin was too deep for God's arm to rescue thence the foulest sinner, nor any holiness, which even he had imparted, sufficed to admit to the glories of his kingdom, without the birth of water and the Spirit.

"Cornelius was already in a measure sanctified; and therefore he, who 'giveth more grace,' translated him into the kingdom of his dear Son, chose him first of the Gentile world to be a member of Christ, regenerated him, and then sanctified him wholly; that 'all who glory, might' henceforth 'glory in the Lord.' Cornelius had faith, 'for without faith it is impossible to please God;' he had love; he had self-denial; he had the power to pray given to him; but he had not Christian faith, nor love, nor self-denial, nor prayer; for as yet he knew not Christ: he could not call God Father, for as yet he knew not the Son.

"Faith and repentance, in adults, are necessary to the new birth. That, God imparteth as it pleaseth him, according to the depths of his wisdom; it dependeth not, as faith and repentance in some measure may, upon the will of man, but of God, who calleth into his Church whom he will."*

Nevertheless, he says, that as Cornelius was "already in a measure sanctified" in his conversion, his case is by no means a precedent to warrant a similar inference in behalf of any other individual whatever. The only reason, however, which he gives for this opinion, is that it was "an insulated case," or, in other words, a remarkable exception to the general rule.

St. Paul's case, however, he says, is one which shows that, while he was so distinguished, without being sanctified in any measure, before his reception of the sacra-

* Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism, by Dr. Pusey, p. 177.

ment, that such a distinction ought not to be "expected or looked for by others!"

In regard to Cornelius, he further remarks as follows: "Yet it is not simply as being a single case, that it may not be drawn into a precedent; but that it was, of its very nature, an insulated case. It was a miracle wrought for a specific end, an end accomplished once for all, and consequently no more to be again expected than that to which it corresponded, the visible descent of the Holy Ghost at the day of Pentecost, and the visible dwelling of the fiery tongues upon the Apostles. And they who would claim it as a precedent for the Christian gift of the Spirit independently of baptism, must, if they follow Scripture, support that claim by the same evidence which was then given, the gift of tongues, which attested His presence."*

But notwithstanding he maintains that the above was a "single," and "of its very nature an insulated case," "a miracle," "accomplished once for all," and "consequently no more to be again expected than that," he goes on to remark, that, "whereas He (God) once poured out the Spirit upon the first fruits of the Gentiles before their baptism, they would infer that, therefore, He may, and so does now, bestow regeneration, not before, but long after baptism, upon the majority of such Christians as, according to them, are ever regenerated at all."†

Now, according to Dr. Pusey, the gift of regeneration is never bestowed either before, or at any time after the administration of the sacrament, but only and *exclusively* at that moment; and, moreover, if it be afterwards lost, that we have no good or sufficient reason to hope for its recovery *until the day of judgment*.‡

* Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism, by Dr. Pusey, p. 179.

† Ibid.

‡ As baptism is, with the Oxford school, the only or *sole* outward instrument of justification, they of course exclude the Holy Eucharist itself as an outward instrument, whether of its increase or of its confirmation. Thus, while they make baptism the only outward instrument, and faith the "only inward instrument," to these they add *two distinct formal* causes, viz.: the righteousness of Christ for one, and "our own inchoate" for the other; and, in this way, they conceive the whole to form the true "*unity of the Catholic doctrine!*"

Dr. Pusey, however, it seems, even cites the authority of *Calvin* (!) in confirmation of his own views. For, after stating that Servetus had objected to infant baptism, on the ground that Cornelius was baptized after he had received the Holy Spirit, "Calvin," he says, "answers rightly, 'how wrongly he draws a general rule from an instance, appears from the eunuch and the Samaritans, in whom God observed a different order, so that baptism *preceded* the gifts of the Spirit.'"*—*Inst.* 4, 16, 31. *Arg.* 14.

We confess, however, that we do not see the advantage which Dr. Pusey would thus draw from this answer of Calvin, even on the supposition of his infallibility; for if the sacrament, in the cases he refers to, *preceded* the gift of the Spirit, they are, it is plain, by no means in point on the doctrine of Dr. Pusey, who contends that the gift is *not* preceded in the order of time by the sacrament; but that the two are *contemporaneous*, and, moreover, in such a manner, that the former (excepting the above-named cases) is always tied or limited to the latter. This is Dr. Pusey's view on the subject, as far as it may be understood, but it evidently is not the view of Calvin. The reader, however, need hardly be reminded, that, according to the creed of the Church of Rome, the one is as far from Catholic truth as the other.

We insert the following conclusion of Dr. Pusey on the case of Cornelius, as a striking specimen of the uncertainties, doubts, and bewilderings of private interpretation, as applied to Scripture, which, nevertheless, he claims, as we have before noticed, to be a *competent judge* of the doctrine of his Church: provided, he adds, that we do not acknowledge the province of a judge, in the sense in which it is generally understood by Catholics and Protestants, or, in other words, by the Christian world at large!

"It is then," he says, "a question of no moment, and one which we are not *perhaps* qualified to determine, whether the miraculous gift of the Holy Ghost to Cornelius and his friends conveyed to them the complete gift of the new birth, so that their baptism, as has been

* Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism, by Dr. Pusey, p. 179.

said, was for the body only, to confer on that a principle of immortality. The language of Scripture is undecided; on the one hand, since it is inferred from this miracle, wrought to justify their admission to baptism, 'then hath God to the Gentiles also granted repentance unto life,' it might be thought that to them also baptism was given 'for remission of sins;' on the other, it has been inferred, that where Scripture says, that 'God had purified their hearts by faith,' it meant, that in their case also, as well as that of the father of the faithful, a simple faith had been accepted by God, and that he, thereupon, 'purified their hearts' by the direct, *unmediated* (!) gift of the Spirit. And, *as the language of Holy Scripture is doubtful*, so neither do we know enough of the mode of the presence of the Holy Spirit, to be able to say, whether his descent with these miraculous gifts involved also his sanctifying presence; or, whether again, that sanctifying presence did in their case involve the gift of adoption in Christ. But since a distinction was so far made between them and the Apostles, however like their history as to the miraculous gift of the Spirit, that the Apostles were after our Lord's ascension only 'baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire,' but in the case of these, the baptism of water was added, it *seems probable* that baptism conferred its share of benefit also, and made them partakers of the adoption as sons of God in Christ, making them members of him, and of his own body."*

His precise meaning in regard to the case of Simon Magus, we confess ourselves quite at a loss to comprehend. "Though his belief," he says, "was of the lowest kind, still there appears no ground for questioning its *sincerity!*"†

Afterwards he adds the following, the application of which, we submit, without comment, to the decision of our readers.

"The Lord cast out of the temple those who sold doves; but the dove denotes the Holy Spirit; Simon *then wished to purchase the dove! and to sell the dove!* the Lord Jesus Christ, who dwelt in Peter, came, and

* Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism, by Dr. Pusey, p. 181.
† Ibid, p. 185.

with a scourge, cast out of the temple the wicked trafficker,"* although, in Dr. Pusey's opinion, there appears no ground for questioning the *sincerity* (*!!*) of his faith.

"*Calvin*," (*!*) he says, "*also supposes* Simon's belief to be real, (and sincere?) though he afterwards *modifies* his statement in conformity with his system,"† as is quite natural, or rather usual, in all private or imaginary interpretation. He then quotes from Calvin the following passage. "In that faith is ascribed to him, we do not understand, with some, that he pretended a faith which he *had not;* but rather, that, overcome by the majesty of the Gospel, he believed it *after a manner*, and so acknowledged Christ to be the Author of life and salvation, as gladly to subject himself to him."‡

Now, according to Calvin's doctrine, he believed the Gospel only *after the manner* of wicked men and demons; and, as he gladly desired to gain a sordid end in his baptism, is it not evidently profane, we ask, either to hold, with Dr. Pusey, that he had a formed faith like that of a sincere catechumen, or, with Calvin, that he *gladly subjected himself* to Christ? For, is it not manifest, that a deliberately wicked man is no more capable, as such, of gladly obeying the commands of Christ, than are the devils themselves, who believe and tremble? And with respect to Simon Magus, it is plain that he received the matter of baptism in the same sense that Judas received the Eucharist, or Last Supper; that is, they each carnally partook, in a mere outward manner, of the substance of the respective sacraments, and, therefore, received not the same in their hearts, in consequence of their using them with profanity and sacrilege, to their own destruction.

The views also which the Oxford writers exhibit, in their peculiar system, of the nature and character of Scriptural faith, are no less remarkable than their most singular distinctions in regard to baptism, as well as to their system of the two, so-called, Christian righteousnesses. Dr. Pusey states, that on the former point there are three different and distinct views of doctrine, and

* Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism, by Dr. Pusey, p. 186.
† Ibid, 187. ‡ Insti. 3, 2, 10.

that they also "part widely in their practical effects."* These views he distinguishes by the names of the Lutheran, the Roman, and the Anglican, which latter they "conceive to have been the teaching of the majority of their Church."†

The Lutheran, he says, leads men to consider faith as *a mere act*, whereby they think themselves to have been justified, and as the result of a certain frame of mind, confined simply to *their own feelings*, and to "a going forth *of themselves*," and resting themselves in a certain disposition, by which their reliance on Christ may be ascertained, and by which their love for him, also, may be rightly and surely tested. The effect, he says, of this doctrine is to lead them to act upon a theory, and not upon Scripture, to make the Christian life concentrate in *these feelings*, and to lose sight of its ordinary and hourly duties by considering them as so many carnal observances of a legal and obsolete code. These tendencies, he adds, are doubtless restrained to individuals; but then the checks are, in his view, to be ascribed to "an implanted integrity of God's law within them in spite of their system."‡ In short, their view and doctrine of faith is made to consist in *mere feeling*, or in their own "experience," and in its entire separation from those works and duties "about which Scripture bids them to be diligent."§

Now, the "*theory*" (*!*) of the Church of Rome, he says, is directly the reverse. Instead of leading its members to their own feelings, it leads them to look, in his language, to "their own works as their own;" by which is intended, we must presume, those works which the Church considers as works of faith, otherwise it would be difficult, or rather impossible, to decipher what was meant. And, as "it has," according to Dr. Pusey, "a *Pelagian* (*!*) tendency, although," he adds, "it has been held together with high *Augustinian* (*!*) doctrine,"‖ we must necessarily suppose that the Oxford writers attribute to this theory, as they call it, the principle of a reliance upon men's own works, instead of works of grace wrought in and by us, through the Spirit of grace.

* Dr. Pusey's Letter, p. 47. † Ib., p. 46. ‡ Ib., pp. 47, 48.
§ Ibid, p. 48. ‖ Ibid, p. 49.

This, however, they do not say, for it does appear that their own doctrine on the subject of works is so very obscure, that it is no easy task to discover the precise distinction which they actually hold on *this point;* if, indeed, they intend to make any at all. The "theory" of works, however, in the Roman Church, according to the Oxford school, teaches, or rather induces men, in the words of Dr. Pusey, "to weigh them, balance them, evil against good, make the one compensate for the other, settle their several values; at last, hold *the Almighty their debtor* (*!*) as if the more eminent saints had a supererogation of merits."* To use Mr. Newman's words, "It makes its heavenly grace a matter of purchase and trade."† He also goes on to state at length the *practical abuses* of this alleged theory, both as an illustration of the character of the doctrine, as held by the Church of Rome, and as an evidence against its Scriptural sanction, and its descent from the source of Light and Purity above. But we will not detain our readers, now, by calling their attention to arguments against the unfairness of such a course of procedure, instead of exhibiting the doctrine itself from the authentic sources and documents of the Church, or arguing its merits by a comparison with the lessons and precepts of Holy Writ.

One would think that the practical abuses which have ever prevailed in the world, *under the name* of Christianity, through the lives or conduct of its false or faithless professors, would be sufficient to show the futility as well as the injustice of such partial reasoning, whether it be employed against the truth itself, or against the tendency of its benign and holy influences. For, let weak and erring men do what they will, He who overruleth all for good, will never suffer his own truth to fail; and should it be argued that some, or even many, have not believed, and, like the son of Besor, loved the wages of iniquity, and done the works of unrighteousness, shall their unbelief, we ask, make void the faith of God, or frustrate our Lord's eternal promise to his holy and immaculate Spouse? Shall not, rather, He who sitteth in the Hea-

* Dr. Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, pp. 49, 50.
† Lecture on Justification, p. 8.

vens, laugh his enemies to scorn, and cause even the wrath and wickedness of man to praise the triumph of his Church, and reflect upon its abused and persecuted doctrines a still brighter and more increased glory?

But notwithstanding that the Oxford Divines are so zealous of employing this argument of the abuse of doctrines by individuals of the Roman Church, against the actual tendency of the doctrines themselves, still Dr. Pusey affirms, with most singular inconsistency, in regard to the tenets of *his own school*, that he would not be understood to rest the defence of *any* doctrine, in *any* degree, upon its *apparent tendencies*. Of these, he says, "we are not judges, and might readily mistake them, and *certainly should*, if we would, on *any such a priori* grounds, decide doctrines to be scriptural or unscriptural."* Why, then, we ask, does Dr. Pusey labor so strenuously, with Mr. Newman, in endeavoring to expose the apparent tendencies, whether of the Catholic faith in the Church of Rome, or those of his own school in the Anglican Church, when, he says, we are not only incapable of judging of the true character of the doctrines themselves, by such a course, but that we should certainly mistake them, were we, indeed, to decide upon their merits on such unwarrantable and unlawful grounds?

Nevertheless, in regard to *his own* doctrine, he says, "being persuaded that this is both Scriptural and *Catholic* (*!*) *we may* speak of *its tendencies*:" by what authority he does not inform us, but only, he adds, "with the view to abate a prejudice against it."† But with regard to his detailed statement of the tendencies of the Roman doctrine, are we to infer that this was made, not so much for the purpose of illustrating the nature of the doctrine itself, as with the view of increasing the prejudices which already exist against it in the minds of Protestants? Can we, indeed, suppose the former, when, by *such a course*, our judgment, according to him, would be sure to err; or must we suppose the latter, while persuaded that these prejudices owe their origin and growth,

* Dr. Pusey's Letter, p. 51. † Ibid, p. 52.

not to the doctrine itself, but to a mistaken view, and positive ignorance of its real and actual character?

Be this, however, as it may, Dr. Pusey informs us that the practical tendency of their own peculiar distinction of the two Christian righteousnesses, "directs men to look neither to their faith, nor their works, but to Christ alone, the Author and Finisher of their faith."* Now the Apostles, from whom the Church has received the faith through the teaching of its Author and Finisher, never delivered it in this *severed* and disjointed manner, as their writings most plainly testify, and as their divinely appointed and living interpreter most significantly declares to us, in the unchangeable definitions of her Œcumenical Councils.

But the Lutheran view of faith, according to Dr. Pusey, leads, in practice, to a reliance upon men's *own feelings;* and their theory, as all admit, is justification by faith alone. Now, the Catholic "theory," as Dr. Pusey terms it, in the Church of Rome, has, on the other hand, agreeably to his statement, a Pelagian tendency, as we have before remarked; and thus, while the Lutheran, or, as we should denominate it, the more prevailing Protestant doctrine, leads men to look and trust to their own feelings, the Roman, on the other hand, leads them, according to him, to look and trust to their own works.

With regard to the actual tendency of the Oxford doctrine in the Anglican Church, this is sufficiently illustrated by an exposition of its own character in the definitions of its supporters. As their doctrine, then, plainly separates both faith and works from one another, and also from the Author of faith, it teaches us, at the same time, to look to Christ alone. This, then, is another peculiar distinction of their *Via Media.* For while the tendency of the Lutheran doctrine, according to Dr. Pusey, rather leads men to look to faith alone without works, and that of the Roman to works alone without faith, the Oxford system professes to look to Christ alone, without looking either to faith, on the one hand, or to works on the other.† Now, without denying the above to be the

* Dr. Pusey's Letter, p. 51.

† But because the Lutherans mistake concerning faith, and consider not that charity and a good life are indispensable properties

actual view of the Lutheran and the Anglican faith, it certainly is not the Catholic, as defined and taught in the Church of Rome. For while the alleged *tutissima via* of Oxford professes to avoid faith alone on one side, and works alone on the other, the unity of the Catholic faith as held in her Apostolic Church insists upon no other distinction—no other merits whatever—for salvation, save those only of Jesus Christ, and him crucified. She acknowledges not the doctrine of "*Christ alone*" in severance from his work of faith, of which he is the author and finisher, nor does she admit of any justifying works in man as *our own*, or of any acceptable righteousness but that which is of faith, and by faith, and in faith, as the gift of God in Christ, and which includes, within its justifying terms, every conceivable grace and merit which flows, or can flow, from the supreme source of the everlasting sacrifice.

While the Lutheran, therefore, agreeably to the statements of the Oxford writers, teaches faith, without looking to works, and the latter hold up Christ *alone*, without looking either to faith or works, the Catholic Church

of that faith which justifies, is that, we ask, a sufficient reason why the Oxford Divines should fear to say, with the Catholic Church, that we are most truly justified by the performance of such works as are pleasing and acceptable in the sight of God? Their profession that we are saved simply by "looking to Christ alone," is plainly no answer to the question whether we are saved by faith alone, or by faith accompanied with good works, unless they positively mean to deny that we are justified either by faith, or by good works, or, in other words, by each and both. As to their affirming, elsewhere, as we have seen, that we are saved both by Christ and by *our own* righteousness "at once," we can only here say, that the former position is a self-evident contradiction to the latter. The statement in itself, moreover, of salvation by Christ *alone*, is plainly an *equivoque*, or a *quodlibet*, or what you please; or, in other words, a sentence altogether without meaning on the merits or bearing of the question at issue. Can the Oxford Divines really be ignorant that this depends not on salvation by Christ—an article on which the whole of the Christian world is professedly agreed—but simply and only upon the *conditions* by which this salvation is given? But if they will still adhere to Christ alone, as they plead for, while they disclaim faith alone, and good works alone, we confidently pronounce the propositions, without further comment, one and all, to be nothing less than the mere senseless verbiage of a perverted logic.

looks to *all in Christ*.* Her immutable Truth declares that, without our looking to faith and works conjointly, we can never obtain the blessing of the Lord either now, or in glory hereafter; for as we *walk* by faith, and not by sight, so without the former it is no more possible for us to please Him, and become acceptable in His account, than we can, without holiness, enter into the kingdom of heaven. The Church of Rome shows that there is but one true or Christian faith, and that this very faith constitutes the merits of Jesus Christ, which he procured for his members, both as their justifying and their sanctifying righteousness in him. The Oxford doctrine teaches that simply "*to look* at Christ is to be justified by faith;" but "*to think* of being justified by faith, *is to look from Christ and to fall from grace*;" (!)† thus making the mere difference between "looking" and "thinking" to constitute the cardinal and essential distinction in the plan of Christian Justification! The Church of Rome, on the other hand, instructs us, that merely to look at Christ, is not to be justified by faith, or the merits of Christ, and that to think of being justified simply by looking at, or to, or upon him, or in any conceivable way whatever, save only by living faith in his merits, is to look only at our own thoughts, and to miss the rewards of his grace in that approven path of Catholic Unity which was delivered to us from above in his one Holy and Apostolic Church. There, and there only, can He, with undoubted certainty, be found in the beauty of holiness, and in the *infallibility* of HIS

* From the above, then, it plainly appears that, while the Oxford doctrine professes to dissent so strongly from that of the Roman Church in regard to the justifying merit of good works, it necessarily, although contrary, as we think, to their intentions, excludes them from having any share in our justification. With all their repugnance, therefore, to the views of Lutheranism, we do not see how they can refute the charge of holding, with Luther himself, the following opinion, viz.: that "He would not allow good works to be considered either as the conditions, or the means of salvation, (or justification,) nor even as a preparation for receiving it."—*Note by Dr. McClaine to Mosheim's Ecclesiastical Hist.*, Cent. xvi. sect. iii. part 2, ch. 1.

† Mr. Newman's Lecture, xiii.—"On Preaching the Gospel," p. 388.

EVERLASTING KINGDOM, built, as it is, by its Omnioptent Founder, upon the living rock of Peter, and within the consecrated walls of "the Eternal City!"

FINIS.

POPULAR CALUMNIES

AGAINST THE

CATHOLIC CHURCH.

To those who have never carefully attended to the character and extent of the popular opinions which prevail in this country and in England, on the religious belief and moral principles of Catholics, it would seem not only surprising, but actually incredible, that the former, as we find them, could possibly obtain among communities boasting of the name of civilization.

During the agitation in the English parliament of the celebrated question of Catholic emancipation, we find Protestants, who were the advocates of the cause, declaring, in the progress of their inquiries on the subject, that before actual experience had convinced them of the formidable tendency of the above-named prejudices and errors in retarding its success, they could scarcely persuade themselves it could be necessary to say any thing upon this part of the subject. From the tone, however, which they saw taken by their opponents, and a more extended observation of the feelings of the great bulk of the people, they, at length, became satisfied that this was a point which ought, least of all, to be neglected in a discussion of this kind, and that the greatest obstacle to the triumph of Catholic emancipation would be removed, if the Protestant part of the country could only be disabused of their gross ignorance and delusion in regard to the religious creed in which they differed from their ill-judged and oppressed brethren. Taught, then, by stern and painful experience, they entered, with patience and plainness, upon the task of combating these popular

prejudices, while they could not feel sufficiently indignant at the wilful misrepresentations by which they were excited, through the machinations of unprincipled authority.

In the development of this imposture upon the Protestant mind of the country, its effects have frequently been seen to be so gross as to excite rather the derision than the indignation of all well-informed persons, especially when it is considered how many have been the dupes of a sinister and artful policy, who have not, in many instances, the means of correctly knowing what are, or are not, the real principles of the Catholic faith. And although, through the force of truth when laid open and brought to bear upon the public sentiment, by the zeal and talents of philanthrophic men, the cause of Catholic emancipation was, at length, brought to its accomplishment, still much of the ignorance, which so long retarded its success, obtains, not only in England, but even in our own country, as transmitted to us from our English ancestry, to a degree that would greatly excite the surprise of those whose attention had not been carefully directed to the subject.

Among some of the popular absurdities which were shown to prevail in England by the advocates of Catholic emancipation, we will notice a few, which, we think, it will not be denied continue still to prevail in our own land, and that to an extent calculated to provoke derision, were they not too serious to excite our pity and regret. Let the following, then, suffice as a specimen of the ridiculous charges which we frequently hear alleged against Catholics.

1st. That they do not consider themselves under any principle of obligation to keep faith with heretics.

2dly. That they hold that they may lawfully kill any sovereign or private person who has been excommunicated by the See of Rome.

3rdly. That the Pope can dispense them from the obligation of the most solemn oaths, of whatever nature they may be.

4thly. That they can obtain from their priests an absolution for all sins, without the necessity either of repentance, or any purpose of amendment.

5thly. That they can, even, for a small sum of money, purchase indulgences for any meditated crimes.

That such are actually believed, even at the present day, by multitudes in this country, to be the real tenets of Catholics, will not, I think, be denied by those whose attention has, in any degree, been directed to this subject. And were this fact not too glaring to admit of doubt, one could hardly be persuaded to think that the mere statement of such absurd charges was not sufficient of itself to secure their immediate and entire refutation. For, as we deem it to be self-evident that no society whatever could *possibly* exist among those who hold such principles, so we also think it might be supposed sufficient to convince any reasonable mind that *it is not true* that Catholics hold such detestable principles. But notwithstanding their palpable self-contradiction, and the fact known to all men of intelligence and education, that some of the most enlightened and refined societies in the world have been, and still are composed of Catholics,* the absurdities in question still continue daily to be imputed to the credit of their faith, which, it is also well known, has been embraced and defended by such men as Sir T. More, Fenelon, Bossuet, and others equally distinguished for genius and for virtue.

For the information, however, of those who cannot be satisfied of the falsehood of such imputations as we have enumerated, from the internal evidence which they carry with them of their own absurdity and self-contradiction, we earnestly recommend to their serious consideration, a proof on the subject, of *another* kind, which they may think far more direct and conclusive. We allude to the documents which have been collected on this matter, by Sir John Cox Hippisley, Bart., a member, at the time, of the British parliament, and which have been published in an appendix to a speech, which was delivered by him before that body.†

* To those of our Protestant countrymen who have visited Catholic countries, and whose residence in their society has been sufficiently long to have formed ties of acquaintanceship, such facts will, doubtless, be duly acknowledged and doubly appreciated.

† The work is entitled as follows: "Substance of the Speech of

Among other pieces of evidence which the reader will find in the appendix to the above-named work, there is one alone we think amply sufficient of itself, without any other, to convince every impartial and candid inquirer on this matter. They are the answers of the six principal Catholic universities of Europe, and of their faculties of divinity, to an application made to them in 1789 and 1790, at the desire of Mr. Pitt, for the purpose of ascertaining, from the highest authority, what were the actual tenets of the Catholic Church upon the points which we have above enumerated. The brief extracts we propose to make from these documents will be found perfectly satisfactory; and we think it almost needless to say they were so to the statesman upon whose application they were obtained. In most of them, the expressions are indicative of the greatest surprise, and even of indignation, that a people, so intelligent as the English, should ever have conceived it possible that any civilized men, professing the Christian religion, could actually hold opinions so utterly repugnant to every principle of morality and social order as those which had been imputed to Catholics.

With regard to the first charge, as specified in the list, that Catholics do not think themselves bound to keep faith with heretics, the University of Louvain, after expressing its "astonishment that such a question should be proposed to it," "most positively and unequivocally answers, that there *is not*, and that there *never has been*, amongst Catholics, or in the doctrines of the Church of Rome, any law or principle which makes it lawful for Catholics to break their faith with heretics, or others of a different persuasion, either in matters of a public or private nature;" "and the said Faculty strongly protest against the imputation, that the Catholic Church has, at any time, held a contrary doctrine."*

The faculty of the Sorbonne, in the University of Paris, reply, in a similar manner, that "The tenet, '*that*

Sir John Cox Hippisley, Bart., on seconding the motion of the Rt. Hon. Henry Grattan, to refer the petition of the Roman Catholics of Ireland to a committee of the House of Commons, on Friday, the 18th of May, 1810. With an Appendix," &c.

* Second Appendix, p. 78.

it is lawful to break faith with heretics,' is so repugnant to common honesty, and the opinions of Catholics, that there is nothing of which the advocates of the Catholic religion have complained more heavily than of the malice and calumny of their adversaries in imputing this tenet to them. As *it is rejected by Christians of every communion*, and is repugnant to the fundamental principles, both of natural and revealed religion, we cannot think it incumbent on us to enter upon this subject; and we think it requires no discussion."*

The University of Douay answers, in like manner, "That there is no principle of the Catholic faith, by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics who differ from them in religious opinions. On the contrary, *it is the unanimous doctrine of Catholics*, that the respect due to the name of God, so called to witness, requires that the oath be inviolably kept, to whomsoever it be pledged, whether Catholic, Heretic, or Infidel."†

The Spanish Universities of Valladolid and Salamanca, express their sentiments in similar language.

"The Spaniards," they say, "who, in point of zeal for the Catholic faith, yield to no nation under heaven, have entered into contracts, both commercial and relating to peace, with the English themselves, and with other Calvinistic and Lutheran states; and it would be an atrocious injury, and a vile calumny, to assert that such contracts have been, at any time, violated under the pretence of religion."

The University of Alcala expresses herself as follows: "That she is so persuaded that a doctrine which would exempt Catholics from keeping faith with heretics, or other persons dissenting from them in religious matters, so far from being an article of the Catholic faith, is so entirely repugnant to its tenets, that she could not have believed it possible there should exist any persons who *would dare to impute* to Catholics any thing so injurious."

Now all these answers, it will be remembered, were made by the different bodies without any consent or communication with each other, and it is plainly impossible

* Appendix, p. 82. † Ibid, p. 80.

that they should all give the same false account of their articles of belief, which they knew would be made known, as well in all Europe as among those for whose information they were given.

With regard to the second charge, that Catholics hold it lawful to kill any sovereign or private person under the Pope's excommunication, there is an express testimony of his holiness Pius VI., on this point, in the following language: "We too consider an attempt on the life of kings and princes, under the pretext of religion, as a horrid and detestable crime."

An extract from a work of the learned Gother on "Catholic Principles," and which is used as a manual among members of the Catholic Church, expresses the same sentiment, in language equally strong and decisive in its tone, as appears in the following terms: "As for the king-killing doctrine, or murder of princes excommunicated for heresy, (says Gother,) it is *universally* admitted in the Catholic Church, and expressly so declared in the Council of Constance, that such doctrine is impious and execrable, being contrary to the known laws of God and nature."

With regard to the third imputation, the University of Louvain says, that it is the doctrine of Catholics that "no man, or assembly of men, nor even the whole Church assembled in general council, can absolve or free subjects from their oath of allegiance." To the same effect is the answer of the University of Paris, that "neither the Pope, nor the Cardinals, nor any persons of the Church of Rome, can, by virtue of the keys, or otherwise, absolve or free the subjects of the King of England from their oath of allegiance." In like manner, the University of Valladolid reply that, "Neither the Roman Pontiff, nor the Cardinals, nor even a general council can, in any way, absolve the subjects of the King of Great Britain, or any other persons, whether Catholics or not, from their oath of allegiance, nor dispense with its obligations." The other universities all answer, not merely in like manner, but in nearly the same terms.

The fourth point is abundantly refuted by Sir J. Hippisly, from a great variety of documents of the highest authority. The following passage from a "Book of

Prayers, compiled for the use of Catholics serving in the fleets or armies," by a distinguished prelate of the Church, may be sufficient to satisfy our Protestant readers on this point. "You know," says this learned divine, "from the catechism you have learnt, and the books of Catholic instructions you have read, that the absolution of a priest can be of no benefit to you, unless you be duly disposed to a reconciliation with your offended God, by true faith, by a sincere sorrow for all your sins, by a firm resolution never to commit them again, and by a willingness to satisfy God, and your neighbor also, as far as justice requires. *Without these dispositions* on your part, the act of the priest would not be ratified in heaven; you would be guilty of the profanation of the sacrament of penance, and provoke the indignation of the Amighty, instead of obtaining his mercy."*

On the fifth and last accusation against Catholics, on the score of morality, we copy, with great pleasure, from the pages of the Edinburgh Review, a very pointed passage, as follows:—

"With regard to the vendable absolutions and indulgences, with her traffic in which the Romish Church has been so long reproached, we do verily believe that there are not ten individuals who can read, that really conceive that any thing so utterly absurd or abominable either is, or ever was, carried on with the sanction of the Catholic authorities. Dispensations from *canonical* impediments to marriage, which are not very different from our special licences, and absolution from canonical censures, are issued, no doubt, from the chancery of Rome; but *indulgences to sin, or absolutions from sin*, neither are, nor ever were, granted by this court, or by any acknowledged authority. A fee, too, is no doubt paid to the officer who issues these writs; but this is no more the price of the absolution or dispensation, than the fee paid to the clerk of a magistrate who administers an oath in this country, is the price of the oath. Ecclesiastical penances, moreover, are sometimes commuted into pecuniary mulcts, at the discretion of the proper authority; but these fines always go into a fund for charitable uses: and, in fact,

* Page 44.

a similar commutation is expressly authorized by the canons of our own church: vide *Sparrow's Collection, Articuli pro clero*, 1584; *and Canons* 1640, c. xiv. *concerning Commutations.* Such is the whole amount of the Romish doctrine and practice as to venal absolutions and indulgences." (!)

We have now closed our statement respecting the evidence furnished by the answers of the above-named distinguished universities, on the supposed grounds of Catholic morality. We trust also that our Protestant readers are not insensible to the force of the testimony we have laid before them, and that they are fully satisfied of the fallacy and misrepresentations upon which the prejudice, or rather the antipathy of sectarians against the morality of Catholic faith, has its foundation.

In reference to this subject, we again take pleasure in quoting from an article in the last-named journal, on the question of the Catholic emancipation, the following very spirited and appropriate remarks:

"If half the zeal and industry were employed to allay animosities and correct prejudices, among the uninstructed part of the population, that have unfortunately been exerted in disseminating falsehood and inflaming dissension, we have no sort of doubt that in a very short time the voice of the people of England would be unanimously in favor of the Catholic emancipation. The *very feelings that have been suborned, by the basest misrepresentations, in support of the opposite cause*, would all lead them to this wise and benevolent conclusion. Their regard for their own safety, and the tranquillity and prosperity of the whole empire, would force them to seek the support of all the talent and enterprise which it can supply; and their brave fellow-subjects of Ireland would become the objects of their esteem and compassion, as soon as they were satisfied that they were not the proper objects of their moral antipathy. It is this ignorant, but honest prejudice against the supposed vices and corruptions of Catholics, fomented as it has been by the lowest and most assiduous calumnies, *that has constituted the great strength of their opponents;* and those who wish to see those machinations defeated, must, *to give currency to truth*, condescend to use something of the same exertions

which they have directed so unsparingly to secure the efficacy of slander."*

In addition to the questions on the several points we have before enumerated, as proposed by Mr. Pitt to the Catholic universities, there is also a leading one on the Pope's civil authority, or right of interference out of his own temporal dominions. Their answers to this, it will be perceived, are the same as those made to the former, viz., that the charge is *utterly destitute of truth.* The University of Louvain, after expressing "its *astonishment* that such a question should, at the end of the 18th century, be proposed to any learned body, by the inhabitants of a kingdom which glories in the talents and discernment of its natives," answers distinctly, that "neither the Pope, nor the Cardinals, nor any body, or individuals of the Church of Rome, has any civil authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence whatever within the realm of England." And the other universities all give their answers in a tone equally distinct and satisfactory.

In the appendix of the same work, alluded to above, by Sir John Hippesley, there is a document written with great talent, which is taken from the class-book of the College of Maynooth, in which the same sentiments are enforced, as we have seen in the statements of the universities. It is there distinctly stated, that "Christ has *not* granted to St. Peter, or his successors, any power, direct or indirect, over the temporal concerns of kingdoms." And the following passage is the conclusion of a long argument, to show from what circumstances a contrary notion was maintained by some ambitious ecclesiastics in the earlier ages :

"It is not, therefore, surprising that the claim to this secondary and temporal influence and power, which the Bishops of Rome had long exercised, without objection, should, at last, have been confounded with their right to that primary and spiritual authority, which, *alone*, had been originally imparted by Christ to St. Peter, and transmitted from him by a line of regular succession to them ; especially as *the false decretals* collected by Isidore in the 8th age, the ceremonies of the consecration

* Edinburgh Review, Nov. 1810. Art. I.

and inauguration of kings, and the conduct of princes, who ceased not to court their influence, were favorable to their pretensions to a divine right of interfering in the temporal concerns of states and kingdoms."

That such language as the above could be used by Catholics, we venture to assert, can with difficulty be credited by Protesants in general, who give themselves so little trouble in examining the real sentiments of the former, either on the character of their faith, or the history of their Church. Many, therefore, would be surprised to learn, that the usurped authority of certain ambitious prelates, in former days, is spoken of by all Catholics of the present time in a similar manner, and that these were also regarded in the same light by all Catholics, without exception, who were not involved in the political intrigues and parties from which these pretensions derived their unsanctioned and unlawful origin.

Although, at the present day, the number of those who seriously apprehend any danger to the state from the Pope's supposed right of interfering in civil affairs, or any such alarming effects upon the welfare of society as might very reasonably be expected from *the supposed* principles of the Catholic belief, it is, however, not to be forgotten that the prejudices which were originally created by these fictions, are far from having lost the practical mischief of their uncharitable and still deeply seated influence. And notwithstanding that experience has taught the more liberal and better informed of the utter groundlessness of their fears, there are not wanting numbers, of whom, in the language of Dr. Johnson, we may justly affirm, that while they "can cry Popery! in the present times, would have cried fire! fire! in the time of the deluge."*

* To the testimonies which we have adduced in the above essay, in behalf of Catholic truth, we take great pleasure in inserting the following from the British Critic for January last:

"If the Catholic religion be true, the view of truth which it discloses *must be the very highest.* It comprehends all moral, all spiritual excellence; the whole nature of angels and men, of all the living beings, and all the green things upon the earth; of the earth itself, of the sun, moon, and stars; of every thing which is visible, or sensible, or imaginable in the universe, with all their past and future history, seen according to the innermost realities

of their existence, in their only true relation to each other, and to the One Infinite, Almighty, Eternal, Incomprehensible, and All-perfect Being, who made and sustains them all. The mind is overpowered by the magnificence of such a revelation. It is evident that we have here not only the highest truth, but *all truth, and nothing but truth;* not only the highest beauty, but all beauty, and nothing but beauty."—P. 166.

THE USES OF ADVERSITY.

A PROTESTANT who has never read any writings of Catholic divines on the nature and uses of adversity, or, in other words, on the design and end of the innumerable "ills which flesh is heir to," as revealed to us through the benign light of Catholic interpretation, can have a very imperfect, or at best, a very meager conception on this subject of our healing and peace-giving religion. He has, to be sure, like the Catholic, the same heavenly discourse from the Mount, save, however, the same guarantee of an authorized text and faithful translation; but, then, how different is the feeling and the teaching with which its mysterious truths are associated, according to the distinctive interpretations of their respective creeds! The Catholic, by his faith, is taught, not only with pious submission to bear the afflictions of this present life, but even to embrace and welcome their visitation. This, however, he does not, indeed, for their own sake, nor through any natural love of pain or suffering, of what kind soever this may be, since it would be evidently opposed to all the original instincts of his constitution. The cause, then, of the principle we refer to, is to be sought only in the mysterious value and blessing which the consecrated influence of the Cross has shed upon the rugged, but yet peaceful road to future bliss.

In vain does the philosophy of this world—dignify it as we please with the names of Bacon, of Newton, or of Locke—furnish us with the solution of a question which belongs not to the law or the province of our natural being. Interrogate nature as we may, on such a point, whether in the immaterial world within, or in the physical world around, we shall only find her, on these grounds, as sullen and as silent as the grave itself to which she leads us, and where all her works at length must come and "sink in years."

The page of history may, and often does, disclose to us the phenomena we allude to, as portrayed in the lives and conduct of many a brave spirit, who has nobly "struggled with the storms of fate." But, on the other hand, history alone is unable to teach us their true philosophy and source. And what is this but the great and divine secret which was once proclaimed from the holy mount, published since to all the nations of the world, and now visibly made known to man, in the mysteries of the Catholic faith, and the sacraments of its living Altar?

How truly catholic is the sentiment of the immortal bard, as expressed in the following language of the exiled prince, so familiar to us all!

> "Are not these woods
> More free from peril than the envious court?
> Here feel we but the penalty of Adam,
> The season's difference; as, the icy fang
> And churlish chiding of the winter's wind;
> Which when it bites and blows upon my body,
> Even till I shrink with cold, I *smile*, and say
> This is no flattery: these are counsellors
> That feelingly persuade me what I am.
> *Sweet* are the uses of adversity;
> Which, like the toad, ugly and venomous,
> Wears yet a precious jewel in his head."

From many passages, of a similar catholic strain and tendency, which the writings of our poet so copiously exhibit, we cannot help being often reminded of his having lived in enviable nearness to the "ages of faith," and of the strong proof which they furnish us of a mind which must have been early and strongly imbued with the sacred traditions and wisdom of other and happier days. How strikingly, also, do they testify to the practical and remedial excellence of the Cross, whatever may be said of his own example, or the frailties of a nature which might yet confess, "*probo meliora deteriora sequor!*"

Sir Humphrey Davy, after remarking upon the benign influence of the Christian faith, in seasons of prosperity, goes on to say, that it is only "in misfortune, in sickness, in age, that its effects are most truly and benefi-

cially felt, when submission in faith, and humble trust in the Divine will, from duties become pleasures, undecaying sources of consolation; then it creates powers which were believed to be extinct, and gives a freshness to the mind which was supposed to have passed away for ever, but which is now renovated as an immortal hope."

To what, indeed, can we trace such remarkable and mysterious changes, except to the supernatural power of that truth which lives forever in the words, "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." Of such, the feelings are already loosened from the world, and while they "die daily" to its impressions, whether proceeding from its lights or its shadows, theirs is a discipline to which they bow in thankfulness, and accept as the heavenly mean through which the rewards of an humble spirit are made to flow, being fraught with a peace and hope which earth can neither give nor take away. Such, in fact, is even the acknowledged necessity of this poverty of spirit towards the attractions of this passing scene, in order to the attainment of true content, that, without this grace, the prosperity of man be it as flattering as the earth, with all its praises, may afford, is, in sober truth, no better than an empty dream, or the mockery of a passing shadow. How often does the page of history unfold to us the solemn confessions of those who have tasted the bitterness of a contrary spirit! And what are these but so many practical illustrations of the wisdom of that heaven-born humility, which, as it comes loaded with gifts from the Cross of Calvary, can enable us to bear up cheerfully under "the whips and scorns of time," and find in it a sure relief from all the disasters of our fallen state?

How faithfully is this truth depicted in the following language, which the poet puts in the mouth of the unfortunate Wolsey, in addressing his servant Cromwell!—

> "Thus far hear me, Cromwell,
> And, when I am forgotten, as I shall be,
> And sleep in dull cold marble, where no mention
> Of me must more be heard—say then *I taught thee*;
> Say, Wolsey, that once rode the waves of glory,
> And sounded all the depths and shoals of honor,
> Found thee a way, out of his wreck, to rise in;

A sure and safe one, though thy master missed it.
Mark but my fall, and that which ruined me.
Cromwell, I charge thee, fling away ambition:
By that sin fell the angels; how can man, then,
Though the image of his Maker, hope to win by't!"

And now, amidst all the depths and shoals of this life's troubled sea, where, we would ask, but in the Catholic Church, shall we find a sure, and tried, and perfect way? Her faith at once points us to the royal highroad of her holy Cross. But, in so doing, she leaves us not to the uncertain wandering of our own footsteps, or our own unaided light. She shows us that the Cross is not idly to be gazed upon, but to be borne and carried with us to our graves. While she teaches how we are to endure, and how to sanctify sorrow, she cautions us against that ruinous faith which would account the work of our redemption, which was once finished in our Forerunner according to the letter of the law, to be also finished in his followers, in the same sense and manner in which it was accomplished by Him, and Him alone. She points out to man the dreadful fallacy of his trusting to a bare and transient *act of solitary faith*, as any ground whatever of Christian hope in the purifying salvation of the Cross. All such, she plainly declares to him, "Shall be like a foolish man, who built his house upon the sand;"* a building which cannot endure the shock of this world's elements, because it is not founded upon the unity of the Christian's Rock. But the substance of *her* faith brings him to the incarnate union of the Man-God, who once was dead, but is risen again for our justification, in that He once suffered for us *alone*, according to the law, that we might, also, suffer and reign together with him as members of his own body; not, indeed, according to a sentence of law, but only after the Spirit of the resurrection, and the coming down from heaven of the Holy Ghost.

In this Spirit, she leads her disciple to "the passion of his Saviour, the crown of thorns, the drink of vinegar and gall."† And these she teaches him, by the self-same Spirit, not to regard as mere historical and transient

* Matthew vii. 25. † Digby's "Ages of Faith."

events, finished only upon the wood of the Cross; but as living mysteries, still existing in his risen body, and in the reality of their actual participation within, by all his regenerate members, even now, and here on earth, and, at the same time, in the communion of the saints above. Through these, he learns what "he could never have gained from all the consolations of philosophy,"* "to estimate the value of being condemned to suffer bitterness, and yielding him in return for the proud and lofty spirit which he renounced, the power of preserving his peace while beholding man's unkindness; the power of reducing to a sweet calm that once restless and troubled sea of the heart;" "nay, even the faculty of converting pain, and misfortune, and the dire events of a calamitous life, into images of quiet beauty, on which the memory and imagination may dwell, almost with a poetic fondness."† "Who would not wish to have known, from the first moment of life, this great divine secret, proclaimed, indeed, from the Mount, and yet to many still a hidden mystery? Then youth would have been gentle as the breath of spring, and age as gifted as the sweet luxuriant season, when the powers of nature exhale a living balm for every sense; then, each once proud follower of earthly glory, might exclaim with Dante,

> 'Devoutly joy, ineffable as these
> Had from the first and long time since been mine.'"‡

A Protestant, when, for the first time, he reads the lives of the canonized saints of the Church, will meet with many things which, in accordance with the principles of his own private and limited judgment, must appear to him, not only as incredible in themselves, but as unmingled foolishness and absurdity to his understanding. Their austerities and extraordinary love of mortification and self-punishment seem to him only as so many vestiges of barbarism—as the natural offspring of the dark ages, as the historians of his party call them—as the infatuations of monkish ignorance and superstition—or as the morbid workings of an unnatural and depraved appetite.

* Digby's "Ages of Faith." † Ibid. ‡ Ibid.

The Catholic, on the contrary, knowing the evidence upon which the certainty of the facts is supported, and believing in the supernatural graces by which alone they can possibly be accounted for, sees in them nothing at variance with the fundamental principles of his belief, confirmed and established as it is by the universal sentiment of his ancient and divinely guided Church. The self-assumed theory that the age of miracles has passed away, he knows to be not only destitute of proof, but contrary to the common experience of mankind, as authenticated both by the testimony of the fathers, and of profane historians, and admitted also by the acknowledgments of many learned and distinguished Protestants themselves.* He believes and knows that, in the words of Hamlet,

* "In the middle of the fourth century," says Dr. Milner, in his End of Controversy, "happened that wonderful miracle, when the emperor Julian the Apostate, attempting to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem, in order to disprove the prophecy of Daniel concerning it, (Dan. ix. 27,) tempests, whirlwinds, earthquakes, and fiery eruptions convulsed the scene of the undertaking, maiming or blasting the thousands of Jews and other laborers employed in the work, and, in short, rendering the completion of it utterly impossible. In the mean time, a luminous cross, surrounded with a circle of rays, appeared in the heavens, and numerous crosses were impressed on the bodies and garments of the persons present. These prodigies are so strongly attested by almost *all the authors of the age, Arians and Pagans, no less than Catholics,* that no one but a downright skeptic can call them in question. *They have accordingly been acknowledged by the most learned Protestants.* Besides the testimony of the Fathers, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, and of the historians Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, &c.; these events are also acknowledged by Philostorgius the Arian, Ammianus Marcellinus the Pagan, &c. Bishop Warburton published a book called Julian, in proof of these miracles. They are also acknowledged by Bishop Halifax, Disc. p. 23."

Although the end of Dr. Conyers Middleton's "Free Enquiry," is to discredit the testimony of *all* the fathers, after the times of the first Apostles, and of *all* ecclesiastical writers down to the Reformation, and since that period, in order, by such an absurd and horrible libel upon the whole world, or *human nature itself*, to get rid of the DIVINE ATTESTATION in favor of the Catholic Church, he nevertheless affirms that, "The prevailing opinion of Protestants, namely, of Tillotson, Marshal, Dodwell, &c, is that miracles continued during the three first centuries. Dr. Waterland brings them down to the fourth, Dr. Beriman to the fifth. These *unwarily betrayed* the Protestant cause into the hands of *its*

"There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,
Than are dreamed of in your philosophy."

He regards the accredited miracles of his Church as so many living expositions and comments upon the Scriptural promises in her behalf, and as so many seals and attestations of divine favor and protection. "Amen, amen, I say to you," were the words of our Lord at his last supper, "he that believeth in me, the works that I do, he shall do also, and greater than these shall he do: because I go to the Father."*

But the Protestant, according to the self-interpreting principles of his creed, either regards the histories of the canonized saints in the light of superstitious fantasies, or else rejects them wholly as idle tales, or cunningly devised fables. He stops not, for a moment, to examine or inquire whether what he reads might not possibly be so many extraordinary gifts, and miraculous endowments of grace, communicated to these distinguished servants of the Cross, and which, he believes, was thus imparted in the days of the first Apostles. His philosophy of rigid experiment, which extends even to his faith, will not permit him to suppose that the faculties and senses of man may, possibly, be so far prepared or modified by an influence from above as to sustain the effect of suffer-

enemies."—Introd. p. li. "If we admit the miracles, we must admit the rites for the sake of which they were wrought: they both rest on the same bottom."—*Introd.* p. lxvi.

Besides the names of the Protestant writers, mentioned in the preceding passages from Dr. Middleton, as admitting the continuance of miraculous powers in the Church down to the fifth century, we may add those of Abbadie, Dodwell, Mosheim, and other learned Protestants, in relation to one in particular which took place in that very age. For the details of this, we would refer our readers to the 23rd Letter of Milner's End of Controversy.

The remarkable miracles of St Bernard, in the 12th century, as related in the histories of the Middle Ages, are witnessed by the testimony of all France, Germany, Switzerland, and Italy. The eminent sanctity of this learned father has been freely acknowledged by Luther, Calvin, Bucer, Œcolampadius, Jewel, Whitaker, Mosheim, &c. For a learned and authentic statement on the subject of miracles, we again beg to refer our readers to Dr. Milner's interesting letters on the same, in his "End of Religious Controversy."

* John xiv. 12.

ing, so that either the wonted phenomena it exhibits, in ordinary cases, may be no longer produced; or else that the consolations of heavenly favor, imparted through their medium, may not in reality be immeasurably more than an equivalent for their attendant pains and inconvenience. But, be this as it may, to the Catholic such principles are *facts*, which rest upon the incontestable evidence of his faith and Church; and although contrary, as they must be, to the common or ordinary experience of man, still do we maintain, on the authority and precepts of the Written Word itself, that, while they exceed the power and reach of reason alone, they, at the same time, defy the evidence of its contradiction, and mock the sophistries of its perversion.

We think, moreover, on a question like this, it is no less a dictate of prudence, as antagonists for truth, than it is of Christian obligation, as defenders of the faith, always to bear in mind, that, while it is one thing to *doubt*, it is quite another thing to *disprove*. As advocates, also, of the inspired writings, all must grant it to be an indispensable part of right reason to be *sure* that our very caution be not founded on principles which may be incontestably at variance with the whole tenor and Spirit of revealed truth; and that, while cherished by us as sound and conclusive in determining our religious belief, they may not, in reality, serve only to impugn the authority of Christianity herself, and to assail the very foundation on which she rests. Who then does not see that, in thus attempting to defend and exalt the principles of our finite reason, we virtually become the abettors of a system which strikes at the very roots of our most holy faith! And how else shall we, in truth, describe the substance of an argument like this, but as a repetition of the trite and senseless plea,—that the works which once testified to the divine foundation of our religion are repugnant to the dictates of reason; and on no other ground than because they are mysteries which cannot be explained by the ordinary laws of nature, or the known phenomena of worldly science!

In returning to the subject from which we may appear somewhat to have digressed, we beg to conclude with the remark, that we are far from intending to affirm, that

that the Protestant rejects the salutary tendency of affliction, when properly borne in obedience to the divine commands; still we repeat, that the impressions with which he is accustomed to receive its truth, whether through the discourses of his ministers, or his own inferences from the Scriptural text, are calculated to make him regard it rather as a doctrinal abstraction, than an actual and abiding reality. Certain it is, that with him, they fall far short of the practical lessons of the Catholic Church, and of the exemplifications of *her* Cross, in the holy and unearthly lives of her venerated and canonized saints.*

* In order to show the extraordinary caution and vigilance observed by the Church in examining the genuineness of alleged miracles, we copy from an "account (by the Abbe Gerbet) of the proceedings and ceremonies which take place at the canonization of saints," the following paragraph :—

"Few persons are aware of the extreme rigor with which the investigation is conducted. It assumes all the forms of the most strict judicial inquiry. Nothing is admitted as proof, that would not be received as evidence in a court of justice : every deposition must be on oath, all the details are entered into most minutely, and sifted most rigorously. The promoter of the faith is chosen from amongst the most learned, and is sworn to fulfil his duty with fidelity. His principal duty is to bring forward every possible objection, either against the truth of the allegations, or tending to show that the facts which are proved, could possibly have happened without a miracle. He is assisted by the most able physicians and surgeons, and men versed in the natural sciences. Every most minute circumstance is contested step by step, no efforts are spared to throw doubt on the credibility of the witnesses, to trace their opinions to the workings of the imagination, to show that there is not *absolute demonstration* that supernatural influence must necessarily be admitted : and if they can succeed but in this, or the least doubt remain on any ground whatever, the alleged miracle must be laid aside as not sufficiently proved.

"The depositions, with all the objections thus made, are printed and handed to the consulters of the Congregation. It is their duty to weigh every thing maturely, and hand in their opinions of the whole in writing, which are likewise printed, and copies of the whole distributed a sufficient time before the meeting amongst the different members of the Congregation. With all the information that is collected in this manner, they proceed to the investigation ; it is adjourned from one meeting to another, the ever vigilant promoter watching every step, and point by point a decision is pronounced on each, either setting it aside as not proved, or pronouncing it beyond doubt, until matters are arranged in a manner to justify the call for the general meetings spoken of above.

"Every one must feel that heavy expenses must necessarily be incurred in carrying this process through its various stages: a great deal of printing is to be done, witnesses are often to be brought from a great distance, or inquiries to be made in distant places by competent persons; physicians or other men competent to aid in such matters, cannot be engaged to act efficiently, with much labor and loss of time, without a proper remuneration.

"Copies of the above-mentioned proceedings are easily procured at Rome; a person will often meet with a process containing the depositions of the witnesses, the subtle attacks of the promoter of the faith, the answers of the advocates who defend, and will feel astonished that it could have been thought necessary to be so fastidiously rigorous, and learn, perhaps, after all, that these same miracles were rejected as not sufficiently proved. Dr. Milner speaks of an English Protestant gentleman, who met at Rome with a printed process of forty miracles which had been laid before the Congregation of Rites, which he considered so satisfactorily proved, that he expressed a wish that Rome would never allow any miracles to be considered authentic, but such as were proved as well as these; when, to his astonishment, he was informed that every one of them had been rejected.

"Some expressions of contempt for the Roman tribunals used by Frederick the Great of Prussia, reached some high dignitary in that city; he procured a copy of the whole process of a saint whose cause had just before been concluded, and forwarded it to the king. Frederick, having perused it, was heard to exclaim, *A man whose cause is approved at Rome, must indeed be an honest man;* words which meant a great deal in the mouth of the *roi philosophe*." "It has become a proverb in Italy, that it is *next to a miracle to get a miracle proved in Rome*."

EVIDENCE

OF THE

SACRED WRITINGS.

If it be admitted that there is a necessity of some *external* evidence for the divine truth of the Scriptures, or for their authenticity as a message or revelation from God, is it not evident that the authority of that evidence should be, at least, equal to the authority of the writing or written word to which it testifies, in order that our "faith might not stand on the wisdom of men, but on the power of God?" Is it not evident that the truth of the one should be no less infallible than the truth of the other; that the declaration of the witness should be entitled to a like degree of reverence with the writings to which it may testify; that the authority of the former should be no less divine than that of the other, unless, indeed, we deny that we are bound to place a secure reliance upon its report, or receive it with such a consideration as is requisite to a positive settlement of so momentous a question? Must it not be the authority of such a living and speaking witness as may not only be appealed to at all times, but one which is competent, also, to give us such instruction as none but God himself could give, or authorize to be given by others in his stead or name? Any principle of authority short of this, or which is merely human, or which may even belong to an angel of light, without the express warrant of a divine commission for the particular work, must, it is evident, be altogether insufficient in its applicability to a judgment which, to answer its end, can be nothing less than imperative and infallible.

No other faith, then, in behalf of the authenticity or

divine revelation of the writings which we esteem to be inspired, as is not founded on the unerring knowledge, immutable truth, and Almighty power of God, is, manifestly, adequate to bring with it, either such a measure of credibility, or such a species of assent, as is essentially necessary to warrant our conviction of their divine origin, and establish an imperative claim upon our veneration.

The necessity of some kind of evidence, in behalf of the genuineness of the sacred writings, independently of the truth of the facts and doctrines they contain, is admitted by all Protestants ; and, as this will not, we think, be denied, it is hardly necessary, at present, to prove the acknowledgment by any specific references to their writings. In fact, the reasonableness, not to say necessity, of this admission, is too obvious not to exclude all possibility of its contradiction. How far, and in what manner, this may, of itself, involve the distinctive tenets of Protestantism in a manifest contradiction to Scripture, is a question which we propose as the subject of our present inquiry.

As we think it will not, then, be denied that it is utterly in vain for the friends of Christianity to prove the authenticity of Scripture by any appeal to the fallible authority of mere human tradition or acknowledgment, and, as there exists, at the same time, a necessity, acknowledged by all, for some kind of *external* evidence which cannot err, and as it follows, that this must be of such a nature as can be provided only by the power of God himself, and that through the agency of a visible medium and institution of his own devising, what more, we ask, can the believer of the Written Word desire, in order to solve all doubts on this point, than the positive proof of such a foundation as is there declared to be already laid, viz. : " the pillar and ground of the truth,"*—the mystical body of Christ—the immaculate Spouse of our Lord —the infallible " Church of the living God."†

The Protestant investigation of the question of evidence proceeds, it would appear, altogether on a profound ignorance of the existence of any other discovered prin-

* 1 Tim. iii. 15. † Ibid.

ciple of authority than that which is merely historical, or dependant upon the bare testimony of individual and fallible man. The fact of a living and authoritative principle of spiritual and faithful testimony being delivered by our Lord, through his Apostles, to a divinely constituted and visible society of followers, instead of being received by them as "the power of God and the wisdom of God,"* is, in their sight, no other than what its crucified Head once was, both "to the Jews and to the Gentiles;" to the one, "a stumbling-block," to the other, "foolishness."†

Hence it is, that whenever Protestantism refers to tradition, it uniformly speaks as if this were no other than the blind and corrupt tradition of Jewish Pharisees and rulers; forgetting that the tradition of Christ is founded, not upon the mere private judgments of short-sighted and erring man, as were the glosses of ancient Rabbi, and the perverted teachings of a Hebrew sanhedrim, but upon the eternal power and promise of his own Incarnate Word, speaking by his Spirit in the voice of his own living and spiritual body.

The advocates, however, of the Protestant rule of evidence, although they strenuously deny the authority, or rather, the very existence of a Church, which cannot deceive, or mislead us into heresies, appear, however, as we have before remarked, very generally to acknowledge the necessity of some external evidence for the verification of the writings which *they* esteem to be the *only and sole guide* of leading man into the knowledge of all spiritual or religious truth. And, although their main theory on this article is developed in different modes, according to the particular taste or fancy of the writer, or the complexion of the faith to which he is attached, it is worthy of remark, that their researches, one and all, pursue the same vain and illusive phantom of a mere human and fallible testimony. While some, indeed, reject the Fathers as unworthy of their notice, those, on the other hand, who profess a due respect to the authority of their writings, consult them, it is evident, not so much for ascertaining the unanimous and ultimate

* 1 Cor. i. 24. † 1 Cor. i. 23.

consent of the Catholic body by which they were ruled, as it is to discover from their individual expressions, some apparent warrant for such prejudged opinions as their professed admirers deem themselves bound to defend. In these cases, they are sure to account them, as Chillingworth rightly says, "fathers when for, and children when against," their own private and preconceived views. Even Dr. Middleton himself, who, in his "Inquiry into Miracles," makes so light of the opinions of the Fathers, yet courts their sanction, with no small assiduity, when endeavoring, in behalf of his favorite system, to allegorize the Mosaic history of the creation.

We see, therefore, how utterly useless it is to abide the settlement of a controversy, on any disputed point, by appeals to the writings of the Fathers, where the differing parties are not mutually agreed in an acknowledged obligation to the authoritative consent of a supreme and unerring tribunal, to which recourse may at all times be had, and whose decision is equally binding upon the early Fathers as upon all, in every age, who confess the same baptism, faith, Spirit, and Lord, and whose apostolic unity in the body is admitted to be equally imperative over all its members, and in all things that belong to it, as well visible as invisible. For the Fathers, in themselves, might err, even in their teachings of the truth once delivered for all, (as well for them as for us also,) to their first and saintly predecessors in the apostolate. Indeed, we know too well how Tertullian erred, not to mention the names of Origen, or even that of the blessed and canonized Cyprian.

A tradition founded merely upon the writings of an Augustine, a Chrysostom, or a Polycarp, or, in fact, upon the evidence alone of any single one of the Fathers, is not such a tradition as that of the Church, or which she received from those who were specially called for the work. Far be it from us to maintain that the statements of those who were not thus chosen, are to be placed upon the same ground, or the same authority, with that of the Inspired Volume. But, on the other hand, we do maintain, that the oral and equally inspired communications which were delivered to the Church by her first Apostles, are founded upon no less obligation, or authority,

than that of the Sacred Writings themselves. Such apostolical tradition is as much the work of the Lord himself as are the contents of the Holy Book. Both have originated from the same heavenly source, both have been transmitted by the same Spirit, preserved by the same Body, taught by the same ministerial order, commended by the same acknowledged doctrine, manifested by the same unity of faith, and implicitly enjoined upon our obedience by the same sovereign and unerring authority.

When we speak, therefore, of the apostolical tradition of the Fathers, it is not their own individual opinions to which we refer, but only to that faith or doctrine which was received by the first or inspired teachers themselves, and which has ever since been retained in the spiritual body of our Lord through the unity of its undivided and unanimous consent. The same doctrine, moreover, has ever, from time to time, as we may learn by the ecclesiastical records, been made known, as the occasion demanded, through the unerring power and medium of general or œcumenical councils. And although individual ministers themselves might, on some points, err in their teachings, whether by word or by writing, the general guidance of the whole, at every period, into all truth is infallibly secured by the eternal promise of the Most High.

It is not, therefore, as to the traditions of mere men that we look into the writings of the Fathers for an authoritative rule of our faith and obedience, but simply as they are most valued evidences, of their kind, of the Catholic traditions of Christ himself, as transmitted to his immediate Apostles, and continued to their successors by his providential guidance, in the same order as it was once delivered to them, or in the same visible unity and vicarious primacy of its federal and representative head. While no private expositions, therefore, of any members of the Church can, according to her creed, be enjoined as infallible, is it not a manifest and most grievous contradiction in her adversaries, to cite passages, from the Fathers, of an insulated nature, against the expressed authority of a unanimous or universal consent? For, whatever consideration may be attached to

the authority of individual statement, it is to be noted, that while such a principle constitutes the acknowledged basis of Protestant faith, it is idle to suppose that such is, or ever can be preferred by Catholics, to the united testimony of the general body.

The existence, moreover, of oral traditions, or revelations of truth, as delivered by the inspired Apostles to their followers, and, from the necessity of the case, in a manner different from those contained in their writings, are facts which may be proved by the evidence of the records themselves. The authority, therefore, must necessarily be of equal obligation with those which we find to be actually expressed in the Written Word. Since, then, we are informed by the latter, of the existence of a divinely constituted, or organized society, called "the Church of the living God," and "the ground and pillar of truth," and, at the same time, of an explicit revelation to its Apostles of the divine promise to conduct it into all truth, together with the express command of our Lord, in person, to hear its decisions as his own, under the pain or penalty of being accounted as heathens and publicans, how, we ask, can we deny its authority without a denial also of the authority of Scripture? By consulting, then, the voice of this Church, which we are thus imperatively bound to obey, we find that she has invariably, and by universal consent, from the days of her first pastors to the present time, observed practices and rites of which no explicit account is given in any of the canonical writings. Such, for instance, is the observance of the first day of the week as the Lord's day, in the place of the seventh, or Jewish Sabbath; as, also, her constant and uniform practice of infant baptism. The observance of these precepts, as commandments from the Lord, would be not only unwarranted, but altogether destitute of the sanction of divine proof, did they not rest upon the standing and living authority of the Church, as exercised by her in the name of her Heavenly Head, and by virtue of the commission originally given to her, and by which she, at once, received both the faith itself, and the keys of its authoritative exposition.

That oral communications, therefore, were made to the early Church, by her first Apostles, of truths which

they had received from the Lord, but which were not also delivered in writing or by epistle, and, also, that these two distinct modes of communication are of equal authenticity, and equally deserve our highest reverence—and that these revealed truths themselves, thus differently delivered, are, each and every one, equally binding upon our faith and practice,—and that they proceed from the same heavenly source, and rest upon the same infallible sanction as revelations of the same divine will,—are all matters of incontrovertible fact, which can never be consistently denied by those who profess to receive the holy Scriptures as an undoubted record of the Written Word of God. But since the Inspired Writings themselves are not the witness of the particular nature and character of such divine communications as do not make a part of their contents, but testify only to the fact that such were orally delivered; is it not, then, evident that we are, according to the testimony of the writings themselves, to seek for these unwritten truths, only in the bosom of that society to which they were originally transmitted, and to that authoritative exposition of their principles, which was delivered to her alone, by the voice of the Lord himself, and perpetuated by the power of his Holy Spirit, in like manner as was imparted to her in her beginning and foundation?

While the Church, therefore, is acknowledged by Scripture itself to be the unerring and infallible guide to Catholic truth, it is plain that even the writings of the Fathers do not, in themselves, constitute an infallible evidence to the divinely inspired truth of the Sacred Volume. Such evidence, indeed, does not constitute that heavenly proof which can alone determine the momentous question of its divine authenticity. However high, therefore, may be the respect due to their venerable names, or the undoubted sanctity of their divinely attested character, yet their testimony alone, it is plain, must not be substituted for the testimony of the Church herself. The statements of the individual Fathers may not, on every point, exhibit an unerring and faultless exposition of the faith, in all the undeviating exactness and purity of its incorruptible and inspired excellence, but they afford, in the main, the highest presumptive evidence of the faith as it

was held in their times by the Church, in the absence of her own authoritative decisions. Their testimony, then, of its kind, while it affords us the highest degree of authority short of the positive evidence of the former, gives us, however, at the best, no certain warrant or security against the individual liability of man to mistake or error. While the highest regard, therefore, is due to their writings, as men who in their best estate may err, and to their testimony to the general sense of *all* the members, we must remember it is to these only, in their collective and Catholic capacity, that they are entitled to the promise of an overruling and infallible guidance into the knowledge and doctrine of all truth. It is, therefore, evident, that had there never been a divinely guided and organized body as the Apostolic Church, we could never have had any certain assurance of the inspiration of the Scriptures, or that they were, in fact, an accredited revelation to man of sacred and heavenly truth.

But notwithstanding the manifest impotency of any appeal, in behalf of the authenticity of Scripture, to such external evidence as does not carry with it the seal and impress of a divine authority, no Protestant will ever deny the necessity of *some kind of outward* testimony in relation to the above-named fact. The nature and kind of evidence, however, according to the adopted faith of Protestants on this point, and which, by them in relation thereto, is deemed to be entirely satisfactory and conclusive, is one which will be found to rest its claim for our regard upon a ground no higher than the mere principles of our own natural and erring reason. A remarkable instance and illustration of this is to be met with in an elaborate work in the Edinburgh Encyclopædia on the article "Christianity," from the pen of Dr. Chalmers, an eminent and distinguished minister of the Church of Scotland. This was so highly approved of by the proprietors of the above-named Encyclopædia, as to be deemed worthy by them of having the substance of it published in a separate form for general reading; and thus it also appears before the public in a treatise under the title of "The Evidences and Authority of the Christian Revelation."

In this work, the talented and ingenious author, in conformity with the natural tendency and development of the above-named principle of Protestantism, will be found to construct the whole fabric of his argumentation on the following very singular, but no less fallacious proposition, viz.: that it is a matter of essential importance, in the inquiry, to consider the Scripture record as one standing merely on human testimony, and supported only by the ordinary tests of historical truth. This he conceives to be the view which is necessary to be *first* taken of the Inspired Volume.

His principle of investigation he further attempts to sustain, on the alleged ground of its conformity with the maxims and rules of the "*Baconian philosophy!*"

"What," he asks, "is the evidence I have that this is a true history? What assurance have I that such a person as Jesus Christ, did actually appear; that such miracles were wrought; that such doctrines were delivered? The nature of such *doctrines*, it is very possible, may be obscure. I have no example before me of other revelations to prove whether it will be so or not. Much less have I any precedent to supply me with any previous knowledge of these doctrines. But I have precedents innumerable as to the *other* points. No investigation is more easily conducted than that of *historical* evidence. The plainest and most undeniable demand upon my reason is, that I should bring this historical document *to the same test to which I bring all other* (*!*) documents. And the obvious advantage attending this method of proceeding will be, either that I shall discover a fallacy in the evidence for the truth and genuineness of the document itself, which will at once entitle me to reject it as a forgery, or I shall be compelled to acknowledge it as a well-founded and veritable record. In this latter case, what further shall I have to do? Why, surely, to adopt it as true." Dr. C. goes on to say, that this testimony he judges of by rational and incontestable rules, but that the doctrines are, at best, but matter of conjecture.

Now, is it not, we ask, plain, to the intelligent reader, that such an incontestable authority as is here acknowledged by our author, amounts, at best, to nothing more than a mere presumptive and necessarily uncertain spe-

cies of evidence. Can this, indeed, ever be deemed alone sufficient to entitle it, either to that kind, or to that degree of respect, which we should naturally be bound to feel, before the surrender to it of our judgment, on a question of so grave a nature, and of such vital importance as the authenticity of a reputed message to us from Almighty God? For our part, we cannot be persuaded how, in such a case, an appeal to the mere historical evidence of fallible man ought, under any circumstances, to be admitted as *decisive*, by a rational and accountable agent, on a matter of such tremendous import.

But, with due respect to the genius and eloquence of our author, we would ask, who is there that does not immediately perceive the utter repugnance of his theory to the simplicity and force of St. Augustine's decision, when he says that, "unless the authority of the Catholic Church should induce me to it, *I would not believe the Gospel?*"*

The sacred tradition of the Church, then, was the living evidence and rule of this holy and distinguished Father's faith in the truth and authenticity of the Written Word. But with Dr. Chalmers' preconceived opinion on the merits of the "Baconian philosophy," in helping us to investigate proofs for the truth of our holy religion, or the undoubted inspiration of the Scriptural Canon, it is not surprising he should so entirely overlook what the Bible so marvellously testifies to the dignity and authority of the Universal Church. Not to cite various and express passages of Holy Writ, relative to this body "of the living God," and "ground and pillar of the truth," let us hear again what St. Augustine says respecting her sacred functions and jurisdiction. "This Church, moreover, the divine authority commends, and as it cannot deceive us, he who fears to be imposed on, under the obscurity of the present question, (concerning baptism,) *will consult the Church*,† which, *without any ambiguity*, the Scriptures establish."‡ Again: "Do thou run to the

* "Nisi me Catholicæ Ecclesiæ commoveret authoritas." *Contra* ep Fundam, c. iv. v., p. 154. Edit. P. P. S. Mauri Parisius, 1679, *et seq.*

† Eandem Ecclesiam de illa consulat.

‡ Contra Creson, L. I. c. xxxiii. T. ix. p. 407.

tabernacle of God; *hold fast to the Catholic Church;* do not depart from *the rule of truth*,* and thou shalt be protected in the tabernacle from the contradiction of tongues."†

But Dr. Chalmers appears so much wedded to the wise caution and powerful influences of the inductive philosophy, and so confident in the security upon which he proceeds, in the application of its principles to the investigation of evidence for the truth of the Sacred Writings, that, in proposing his argument, (in the ninth chapter of his work,) to atheistical infidels, he gravely puts forth the strange and startling position, "that viewed purely as an intellectual subject, the mind of an Atheist is in a better state of preparation for the proof of Christianity than the mind of a Deist." (!) In this statement, however, it is due to the author to make the remark, though not as in any way favoring his argument, that he throws out of the case any possible obstinacy, or wilfulness of mind, from which the Atheist may derive his negative creed. He supposes him, therefore, (though we see not how he reconciles his hypothesis with the inspired words, that "*the fool* hath said *in his heart* there is no God,") to be an impartial and "*a consistent Atheist.*" (*!*)

Now, it may not be superfluous to remind the reader, that the question before us, is not whether the historical facts of the Sacred Volume, or the doctrines of faith called Christianity, are true; but whether the Book, or historical record itself, containing the account of these facts, is an authentic or inspired revelation from God. We may say, on a careful examination of the manner in which the statements are made by the several writers, and from the internal marks of honesty by which they commend themselves to our reason and conscience, that we believe them to be faithful historians of the facts they relate, and that they are, as such, entirely worthy of our credibility and confidence; but still, it is obvious, that such a belief, or such declarations of opinion, constitute no ground of argument in behalf of the merits of our

* Ecclesiam Catholicam tene; a regula veritatis noli discedere.
† Enar. iv. in Psal. xxx. T. iv. p. 166.

inquiry, and give us no answer whatever to the question respecting the divine inspiration, or the supernatural authenticity of the Sacred Writings.

The apostolic traditions, however, which are not contained in the Sacred Volume, we find, nevertheless, to be admitted, as they must be by all who receive them, of equal authority with the latter, notwithstanding the distinctive profession of Protestantism that the sufficiency of her faith and glory, is founded upon the vaunted basis of *Scripture alone*. Since it is obvious, moreover, that these traditions cannot be proven by Scripture, it is equally plain that the authenticity of the latter cannot be established, in any conceivable manner, except by the external evidence of a visible and divinely authorized Judge and Witness. Without the testimony, therefore, of the *Catholic Church*, it must ever prove to be a vain and hopeless task for any advocates, whatever, of the Christian religion, to defend the authority of its revelation against the attacks of the scoffer or the infidel. The arguments of the latter, therefore, as may be seen by all who have ever inquired into the merits of this controversy, have never yet been answered or repelled, in consistency with the acknowledged grounds of right reason, or the established principles of common sense, without the conservative aid and indispensable authority of *the Catholic and Roman Church*.

Date Due

JAN 2 2007

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01014 5722